

*"We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.  
They master us and force us into the arena,  
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them."*

—HEINE.

---

# The ARENA

---

VOL. XXIII.

MARCH, 1900.

No. 3.

---

## THE MILITARY PROBLEM IN CONGRESS.

### I. REORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

A THOUGHTFUL, conservative body of representative American citizens assembled in convention in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., during the latter part of December. Delegates from nearly every State in the Union were present. It was not a political convention, nor were questions of a partizan character discussed. It was a gathering of men deeply interested in the welfare of the National Guard of the country. Its needs, and the best methods of supplying those needs, were the matters principally considered. As a result of that convention concerted action will be taken to bring to the attention of Congress, and the Legislatures of the various States, the necessity of increasing the efficiency and usefulness of our organized State militia. These gentlemen formulated many valuable suggestions, which will doubtless receive the deliberate consideration of those clothed with legislative authority.

At the outset of this article, I refer to this convention as an evidence of the awakened interest in everything that concerns the future of the National Guard. This aroused public

sentiment is not confined to any particular section of the country, nor to any particular body of our citizens. It is a sentiment prevalent everywhere, and among all classes of thoughtful citizens. Already several bills have been introduced in Congress concerning the National Guard. These have been referred to the Committee on Militia, and will at the proper time receive the attention their importance demands. It is not within the scope of this article to go into details concerning the various militia bills now awaiting action by Congress. It is sufficient to say that all have one object in view, namely, the building up of the National Guard into a large, well-equipped, well-organized, and thoroughly disciplined body of soldiers—a sort of reserve army.

No more valuable lesson was taught by the Spanish-American war than the importance of the questions involved in this discussion. It is true that the members of the National Guard of the whole country did noble service during that conflict. Their gallantry on the field won for them the undying appreciation of their fellow-countrymen. Wherever duty called them they went bravely and fearlessly, and, whether in the field or in the camp, the same unselfish patriotism characterized their conduct. Yet, while not unmindful of the services rendered by these brave fellows, our admiration for their courage and self-sacrifice must not blind us to the defects of the National Guard system made apparent by that war. In pointing out these defects I wish to say that I refer to the system, not to the men who constitute the Guard. They did their duty, and are entitled to the gratitude of a patriotic people.

It is my present purpose to discuss the National Guard only in a general way. I do not propose to discuss it from a purely military point of view, nor to make any suggestions dealing distinctively with the military formation of the Guard. We hear much discussion these days concerning a large, permanent military establishment. It seems to me that the best sentiment of all thoughtful citizens is strenuously opposed to such an establishment. It is contrary to the established prin-

ciples of our institutions. It is an unnecessary burden upon a peaceful, law-abiding people. Unparalleled increase in the cost of government must necessarily result from such a policy. Increased expenses mean heavier taxation, and heavy taxation breeds discontent and unrest. Of course, the results of the war with Spain made it incumbent upon us as a nation to assume certain obligations toward the people who came to us as a result of that conflict. To maintain any semblance of authority in these possessions and to fulfil our international obligations rendered necessary, for the time being at least, a large increase in our army; but, if the possession of these foreign colonies means the continued existence of so large an army, it is a very serious question whether the people will sustain us in their retention at so frightful an increase in our national expenses.

When a war with Spain was declared it found us ill prepared for the emergency. It is true that the call to arms was bravely answered by our citizens, especially the members of the National Guard; but it is also true that the military establishments of the various States presented many unsatisfactory features. This was no fault of the men: it was due almost entirely to the system. The force was poorly armed and poorly equipped. The men went to the front with obsolete guns, and in their organization they showed a lack of proper military instruction. As a result, months elapsed before they could be brought up to that standard of efficiency which active duty required of them. In a properly equipped and properly disciplined National Guard these deficiencies would not be present. It is to meet such emergencies as presented themselves during the Spanish war, and to avoid such mistakes as then occurred, that I have acceded to THE ARENA'S request to say something on this subject.

No thoughtful citizen will deny the imperative necessity of a well-organized and well-equipped National Guard. It is in line with the traditions of our system of government. As a people we are opposed to a cumbersome military institution; but as a people we favor a highly efficient body of citizen-

soldiers. Every instinct of patriotism demands this. Our National Guard system should be guarded as zealously as our system of public school education. Our armories should be nurseries of patriotism. Every inducement should be held out to foster and nourish a sentiment in favor of the National Guard among the young men of the country. The organization should be officered by men thoroughly trained, not only in military science but in the art of handling large bodies of men. It should be their aim to inspire the men under them with a keen appreciation of the true mission of the National Guard. They should not only be taught their duties as soldiers, but they should be inspired with the high sense of duty they owe the State and the nation.

Both the States and the national government owe a duty to the National Guard. The State legislatures should be most liberal in appropriations. The men should be well quartered, and everything done that would add to their comfort. It is incumbent upon the national government to foster in every possible way the State militia organizations. Modern guns and other necessary up-to-date equipment should be supplied. The same arms and equipments that are issued to the regular army should be given to the militia. If the present appropriation of \$400,000 yearly by the Federal government is insufficient to meet the requirements of the militia, that appropriation should be increased to any reasonable amount. Any money expended in making the National Guard an efficient military body is a wise and judicious investment; it is simply preparing to meet an emergency similar to that we were compelled to face when war was declared with Spain.

Right here it is necessary to call attention to the necessity of explicitly defining the status of the National Guard when called into the service of the Federal government. The uncertainty on this important question resulted in many unfortunate controversies at the outbreak of the trouble with Spain. It is true that in a sense the militia is a State body, but when its services are required by the national government it becomes a part of the Federal military establishment. It should



be directly under the orders of the President, and should be prepared to go wherever the emergency of duty called. Of course, when possible, the Guard should be ordered into the United States service as it stands and is constituted under the laws of the respective States. But the exigencies of military service might render this impossible; and, as the first duty of a soldier is obedience, the orders of the President should be obeyed implicitly and without question. If the military status of the militia had been defined without ambiguity, all the confusion and discussion that resulted when the militia was called into service during the late war would have been avoided. The bills now before Congress propose to remedy this defect. The importance of this question cannot be overestimated, and I am glad to observe that men prominent in the National Guard are anxious that it shall be definitely determined.

In speaking of the aid that the national government should extend to the militia, one suggestion occurs to me. I think that the scope of the Military Academy at West Point should be largely increased. Every year there should go forth from that superb institution a large body of young men, trained in the art and science of war, who would not be commissioned in the regular army but would constitute a sort of reserve body of officers. These young men would naturally seek service in the militia organizations of the various States. Their West Point training would admirably fit them for that duty, and they would thus be able to give to the men in the organizations they would join the advantages of their military schooling. I think this would go a long way toward increasing the efficiency of the militia. We saw during the war with Spain the advantages of such a system. Many of the volunteers who received commissions in State organizations were educated at West Point but afterward left the army. Gallant and meritorious service was performed by them. They not only did excellent work themselves, but being well versed in the rudiments of their profession they were able to discipline and make efficient the men who served under them. It

would be a very simple matter to draft legislation that would enable each State, in addition to those already allowed by law, to send a certain number of students to West Point each year to get the training that would fit them for service in its militia organization. The result of this, I believe, would amply justify the increased outlay required to support the Academy at West Point and make it equal to these new demands. I am in hopes that legislation along this line will result from the present efforts in behalf of our National Guard system.

It is almost impossible to get complete returns of the present condition of the National Guard throughout the country. Many of the States have not reorganized their militia since the end of the Spanish-American war, and many have sent in very incomplete returns. To show, however, the necessity of increasing the National Guard, I will briefly refer to returns made by some of the States. New York, including generals and staff officers, has about 14,000 men in service, out of a total of 1,300,000 men liable to military duty. The total military strength of that State authorized by law is 15,000. Massachusetts, out of a total of 499,000 subject to duty, has only something like an authorized strength of 6,000 men. Illinois, out of a total of 853,000, authorizes about 10,000. Pennsylvania, out of 1,043,000 subject to service, authorizes the enlistment of 10,878 men. The other States, in comparison to the number of men liable to service, allow a military establishment nearly in the same proportion as the States enumerated above.

It is thus apparent that there is room for a big increase in the military organizations of all the States. The limit set by the States is out of all proportion to the number liable to duty. In many of the States the organizations fall far short of the number allowed by law. In New York the full quota is nearly always maintained: this should be so in all the States. No question is of greater importance than keeping up the standard of the State militia. When the strength of the organizations decreases it shows that something is lacking in the control of

the military bodies. With proper officers, imbued with the proper spirit, and with the men thoroughly equipped, there is no reason why any State organization should not always have its full strength. When we have a large, well-officered, well-disciplined, and well-trained body of militia ready for service at a moment's notice, the necessity for a large standing army will be materially decreased. No better way of opposing this sentiment can be found than the advocacy of a more efficient and a larger National Guard. I shall do everything in my power to further the interests of the militia in all the States. I believe that the same spirit animates nearly every member of Congress. It is a question disassociated from politics, and is one upon which members of both parties can unite for thoughtful deliberation.

The meritorious service rendered during the late war by the militia entitles it to considerate treatment at the hands of both Federal and State legislators. The sentiment of the people sustains the National Guard in its demand for better recognition. During the great Dewey Day celebration in New York City, the claims of the National Guard on the affections of the people were most emphatically manifested. All along the line of march the men were enthusiastically greeted. Their superb bearing was a credit to the country. The recollection of that great gathering of regulars and militia and the applause that heralded their coming were emblematic of the aroused interest in all that concerns their welfare as military organizations.

In conclusion, let me say that anything I can do, as a member of the Committee on Militia, to give the United States a larger, a better equipped, and a more efficient Guard will be done most cheerfully. I can conceive of no duty more important to the highest and best interests of all the people. THE ARENA, in opening its pages to this discussion, performs a great public service, and it will, I am certain, meet with most cordial approval.

JACOB RUPPERT, JR.

*Washington, D. C.*

## II. THE ARMY SYSTEM: DEFECTS AND REMEDIES.

THE last twenty years have seen the creation of the new navy of the United States; yet that period, the most active in naval improvement in our history, has been the most stagnant for the army. There is no disguising the fact that the navy is the most popular branch of the service in the public mind. It is always easy to secure legislation for the navy, but almost impossible to excite enough interest in Congress or in the country to pass the most meritorious bill for the good of the army. Important as the navy may be for our national welfare, a modern army is of more vital necessity.

It is astounding that, as the years come and go, we fight our battles and win them without ever profiting by the experience of active warfare. After the Revolution the army was to all intents and purposes abolished. The war of 1812 found us unprepared. Had we then possessed even an apology for an army, British America might to-day be part of the Union. The weakness of Mexico counterbalanced our own lack of foresight. A properly organized first line of defense would have brought the civil war to a close within six months. The Spanish war is of so recent a date that it is as needless as it is painful to refer to the dreary series of blunders, to the lack of preparation, and to the incompetence in high places as proof that we were not ready to meet the enemy.

Modern wars, where modern armies are engaged, are very soon over. Should we ever be under the unhappy necessity of going to war with any of the great nations of Europe, we must be able rapidly to mobilize a first line of defense, or the consequences may be fatal. The institutions of the Republic and the sentiments of our people will never permit of the maintenance in time of peace of a large standing army, nor is a large army necessary. The problem presented to us for solution is clearly defined. It is this: How shall we organize our army with the smallest number of men in time of peace so that it will be capable of sufficient expansion in time of

war to furnish a first line of defense or offense behind which we can organize our volunteer regiments to constitute the second line?

The organization of the army of the United States is to-day almost the same that it was in 1865. The world has advanced while we have stood still. We have adopted modern arms and modern material of war, but we have not adopted modern methods in their use. At the close of the civil war almost all the officers in the so-called Staff Departments had seen active service in the field. To-day many of them have made their records as soldiers almost entirely at their desks. A bureaucracy, hampered by red tape and obsolete traditions, can scarcely be expected to keep up with the wonderful march of events during the last few years.

The great defect in our system is divided responsibility. We have a Major-General Commanding the Army who, by departmental regulations, is not permitted to issue an order involving the expenditure of a cent unless he first obtain the consent of the so-called Staff Department having the expenditure under its jurisdiction. The so-called Staff Departments are independent of one another, and report directly to the Secretary of War; so that the actual effective command of the General of the Army is limited to his personal aides-de-camp and his headquarters' orderly, provided always that in commanding them he does not incur any expenditure. The Adjutant General's Department, presided over by its present most competent chief, is as efficient as the law will permit it to be; but it is held responsible by the public for much that it is powerless to prevent or correct. We have no General Staff. The only other modern army on earth that has none is the British, and the lack of success of the British arms in South Africa may be directly traced to this fact.

The General Staff of an army is under the General commanding—the directing force of the army. It supervises the discipline, the organization, the equipment, and the recruiting of the army. It educates and furnishes staff officers to the various subdivisions of the army and military attachés. It



proposes plans of campaign and mobilization. It is charged with the duty of being familiar with the resources and the topography, not only of its own country but so far as possible of every foreign country with which it is liable to come in conflict. It is, in short, theoretically supposed to be omniscient, and is in fact almost omnipotent. For five years I have been waging almost single-handed the fight for a General Staff. It is a most hopeful sign that the present able Secretary of War, in his first report, recommended the organization of what he calls a "War College," which, according to his explanation, is nothing more nor less than a General Staff.

In determining the size of the field army in time of peace the fortress artillery ought not to be considered. We have already in position on our coast 202 eight, ten, and twelve inch rifles, 221 twelve-inch mortars, and 41 large rapid-fire guns. In addition to these there have been ordered, and in less than two years will be in place, 289 eight, ten, and twelve inch rifles and 352 twelve-inch mortars—making a total of 491 great guns and 573 twelve-inch mortars, besides rapid-fire guns, to be cared for within two years. The modern great gun is a delicate piece of machinery that requires for its handling not fighting men so much as skilled machinists. The crew of a twelve-inch gun is thirty-five men, of a ten-inch gun thirty men, of an eight-inch gun twenty-five men, and of a twelve-inch mortar thirty men. These are the smallest numbers of men with which it is possible to keep the machinery of the guns in perfect order, and from which to furnish details for cooks and special duty and one shift for gunnery practise. As a matter of national economy—if we do not wish to let our guns rust and become useless; if we do not wish to waste the millions of dollars expended in their construction and emplacement; if we wish to be prepared to use those guns in case of necessity—we must provide a fixed minimum of men to man them. This fixed minimum, the smallest number that military authorities consider can possibly answer, is 18,000. In time of war that number must be doubled, as a shift must constantly be on duty.

In considering the organization of the units of our field army we should bear in mind that it requires far more time to instruct a recruit in certain branches of the service than it does in others. An infantryman can be made much more quickly than a cavalryman, and a cavalryman more quickly than an artilleryman. In other words, our field artillery and cavalry units should be kept nearer the war strength than the infantry. The cavalry and field artillery regiments should be proportionately stronger than the infantry regiments.

I believe that the correct solution of our problem of line reorganization lies in the organization of infantry regiments with companies small enough to be greatly expanded in time of war, and in the organization of fortress artillery and cavalry regiments composed of two field batteries or squadrons, and one depot battalion or squadron—the latter to consist in time of peace of a full complement of officers but no men, to be expanded in time of war by transfers and recruitment to full strength.

Whatever may be our political opinions—whether we believe in a large standing army or not—there should be no difference upon the question of making our army as efficient as possible. I for one would much prefer to see the United States take the field with a small, perfectly organized army than a vast, badly organized rabble.

GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN.

*Washington, D. C.*

## THE ANGLO-BOER STRUGGLE.\*

### I. INFLUENCE OF DEMOCRATIC IDEALS.

**I**T is fitting that the people of the greatest Republic on earth should send words of cheer to the sorely oppressed people of South Africa. Born as our government was amid the throes of revolution, devoted as we have been and are to the principles of liberty, our hearts should be stirred for these heroic Boers. Centuries ago they invaded the wilderness and rescued a savage land from savage beasts and savage men; and since then they have been contending not so much against these natural adversaries as against the rapacity of the English government.

Having founded the settlement of Cape Town; having caused the wilderness to bloom with industry; having there planted the seeds of empire—the Boers found that, when they had made the land of their adoption attractive and fruitful, the despoiler was at their door, ready to drive them forth. Unable to live as free men in the land they had redeemed from savagery, they moved farther inland. They made their way again across unknown rivers, over trackless plains and steep mountains, and Natal was founded as a Boer settlement. Were they now secure from British greed and oppression? No; again that nation pressed them on, and the alternative was given them a second time: loss of liberty or loss of land and home. They must move farther into the wilderness, or bow their necks to the yoke. Again they took their choice as liberty-loving, patriotic, brave, patient men—farther into the wilderness they went, across other rivers and over other deserts. The Orange Free State was founded. That in part was despoiled, and many of its founders were driven thence into the Transvaal; and now their last stand is taken. They are upon their last heath; they are battling for their last foothold upon earth. Shall they maintain their liberty and homes? This Transvaal country—fourth of their

---

\*See note on page 240.

selection, fourth that they had chosen as their abiding-place, having been driven from three—shall they be driven from this last? That is the issue now being fought out in South Africa.

It is often said that we should be nearer to the English because we speak the same language. But there is a language sweeter and dearer—the language of heart and soul. Tongues may differ; yet this universal language, this language of freedom, makes a universal brotherhood by whom are cherished the prize of freedom and the love of liberty. Liberty to-day makes the language of the far-off Republics of South Africa our language, and that of all people who love liberty.

We ourselves are a nation made up of refugees from tyranny. Most of those who settled this land and developed it came here because they were forced from the lands of their nativity—because tyranny pressed its iron heel upon them too heavily and too often for the spirit of brave men to endure the infliction. In this land we have millions of such refugees and their descendants; and there is no language that can ally us to tyranny above freedom and liberty. A blow at liberty in one corner of the earth may wound to its remotest extremity. It is a blow at the universal body politic. Liberty is at once the dream and the aspiration of right, as well as the hope of the noblest who have suffered and died in the holy cause. If liberty can be crushed in the Transvaal, encouragement will be given to tyrants to attempt to crush it elsewhere. The world-old battle, which will endure until the world ends in the triumph of liberty or its overthrow, is now at the objective point, and the Boer is now in the breach in the far-off Transvaal. Our own liberties will not be so secure if liberty can be stricken down anywhere. In sympathizing with the Boers, and aiding them as far as we may, we are not only performing a magnanimous act; we are helping not only them but ourselves. For there are those in our own land who, while they do not proclaim their purpose, would be glad enough to see caste and privilege emphasized and confirmed, and ordinary humanity crushed in the dust.

Liberty is the birthright of man. Take this from him and you will have robbed him of that which is dearer to him than all

other things, scarcely excepting life itself. For what is life to the brave and the proud-hearted and the noble to whom liberty is denied? Liberty is the mainspring of exertion, the stimulus to higher achievements, the reward for perils past and of battles won. We stand at the very forefront; it has been given to us Americans, under the providence of God, to lead in the march toward the emancipation of universal man.

As liberty goes forward, tyranny recedes. The battle has been waging for ages—victory perching sometimes on one banner and sometimes on the other. It is an irrepressible conflict—in which we participate whether we be engaged in actual warfare or peace blesses our land. We are the exemplification, if not the instrumentality, under the providence of God, of the splendid principles involved in a government by man for man. How the war in that far-off field will end is not for us to know. How it *ought* to end, every man who is free and loves freedom—every man who appreciates the spirit of liberty, every man who has generosity and nobility in his heart, every man who aspires toward noble influences for himself and for humankind—ought to know.

What excuse is there for crushing out those brave people—the Boers of South Africa? Why deprive them of life, or of liberty? Whom have they disturbed in that far-away land of theirs? They have reared aloft the ensign upon which liberty is engraved, and have erected an altar to the divine genius of freedom. None but an enemy of the human race, a foe of human progress, a tyrant, can desire to strike them down. I would that on the wings of the lightning, as Nature's batteries let it loose in the heavens, word might be carried to every soldier in the Burgher ranks—to every embattled hero of freedom on the African veldt—that the day cannot be far distant when the potent voice of republican and democratic free America will be raised in protest following entreaty for the stopping of this unholy war. The hearts of the American people are right; the American people always know what they are for and what they are against. Why should we not make known to the English, to the Boers, and to the world at large that we sympathize with freedom, and that any



influence that we have will be exerted to the utmost to bring about peace in that unhappy land—with the preservation of liberty and the perpetuity of the South African Republics?

There has been much said of late years—or of late days, for it is comparatively recent—about the propriety and the necessity of the United States and Great Britain having a good “understanding” and being on a friendly footing. Why do we need a good understanding with anybody except that which comes in accordance with complete independence for ourselves—demanding nothing more than is our right, and defending our right against every foe? Independent ourselves and confident in our strength, in our geographical position, and in the genius and valor of our people, what need have we for entangling alliances? How can liberty in this land or in any other be furthered by such alliances? They would not make America more republican, more democratic, or more free; nor can we introduce our institutions and ideals into the world abroad by entangling alliances with those who are bitterly and unalterably opposed to them. By sympathy for the down-trodden; by keeping our gates open to the gallant oppressed of all lands; by flying high and untarnished the standard of liberty in *this* land; by sending our good wishes and our substantial support to freedom wherever beleagured, and to liberty wherever assailed—thus shall we best perform our part, both in defending ourselves and in advancing the holy cause of man the wide world over. *No British alliance for us!*

I shall indulge in no words of denunciation. I recognize that in Great Britain there are now, and have been in all her history, many great and noble men. Yet in every crucial period of our history—in the dark days of our birth and in the bloody days beginning with 1812 and ending with the magnificent victory at New Orleans in 1815—Great Britain has been our foe. And to-day she is our rival. At Halifax, in the Bermudas, and at Vancouver, she is erecting great fortresses—against whom? Her guns are pointed toward us; she recognizes in us the mighty power that she may some day, not far off, have to meet in the shock of battle: unless, perchance, by the growth

of the namby-pamby spirit of these latter days, she can wheedle us into an alliance and draw our teeth.

It is the prayer of free men that success may crown the efforts of the South African republicans to defend freedom; that liberty may be preserved; that the South African Republics may live, and that the United States of America may lend her sympathy and her good offices toward bringing peace with honor and freedom; also, that we may proceed on our own career, according to our own devices, unhampered and unchecked by any alliance with the mighty power that has been our foe and has crushed freedom through the centuries in every quarter of the world.

DAVID A. DE ARMOND.

*Washington, D. C.*

---

[NOTE.—The foregoing article and the one following are synopses of addresses delivered at the great pro-Boer meeting held in New York on January 29th.—Ed.]

---

## II. "THE MOTHER OF CIVILIZATION."\*

THE patriotic Boers of South Africa are fighting the battle of all humanity. The war involves at once the most sacred precepts of liberty and the most hateful aspects of tyranny. In all the annals of the race—blood-stained as they are, accursed as past generations have been by the sins of princes and of governments—no chapter ever written is as sad and unbelievable as the history of the South African people.

About two hundred and fifty years ago the Dutch East India Company established at the Cape of Good Hope a feeble settlement of Dutch farmers—for the purpose of furnishing passing ships with fresh supplies of food and for the general accommodation of the seafaring world. But this was not the only office that this struggling settlement, founded in the midst of barbarism, was destined to perform. It became an asylum for many who were driven from other countries in the succeeding century by religious persecution—men of the best blood, the best brain, and the best conscience of Europe. Dutch, and

---

\*See note above.

a large contingent of French Huguenots, formed the population found there in 1806, when Great Britain first acquired dominion over that part of the world.

The great Joubert, who to-day stands in the estimation of the world where George Washington stood a hundred years ago, is the descendant of a French Huguenot family. As a spoil of war, during the reign of Napoleon in 1806, the little colony passed under the dominion of Great Britain. The seeds of liberty had been sown, and aspirations for freedom had been so indoctrinated in the people that they would not willingly suffer alien control; but they did not revolt. They endeavored faithfully to render allegiance to the new sovereign.

Space forbids that I should indulge in details of the petty and merciless persecution which at last drove them to leave their farms, their homes, and many of their kinsmen who lingered behind, and attempt the founding of a new State. In the establishment of the State of Natal over twelve hundred of them perished at the hands of savages. In one onslaught the natives killed old men, women, and children to the number of five hundred and seventy. The leader of the great "trek" of 1834 was assassinated by a savage chief. In the midst of that great trial, when the very stones should have wept in sympathy with that brave people, what office did Great Britain, the "mother of civilization," perform? As the little band crept into the shadow of the African wilderness, beleaguered on every hand by savage foes, a contingent of British troops was sent to search them—to see if they had arms with which to defend themselves. But the British officer charged with this infamous commission revolted against its inhumanity, and notified the Boers to conceal their arms before the search began—and went back empty-handed. Had it not been for that, the poor Boer would have entered the African wilderness without a single gun to defend his wife and babies from assassination. This is the country that, we have been told by some of the newspapers and not a few of our statesmen, has become our partner in spreading civilization abroad!

Soon after this incident British officers appeared and pro-

claimed the annexation of Natal as a British province. A bloody battle was fought between a small contingent of British troops and the Boers, and they crossed a mountain range and founded the Orange Free State. It was annexed, and then they crossed to the Transvaal; and there they stand to-day, with their backs against the wall. There can be no further retreat; there can be no further parley; they have exhausted every means at their command to avoid the conflict, and the battle now being fought by Joubert and his men against the British hosts will determine whether this gallant population shall be exterminated or there shall arise in the Dark Continent another Republic, the duplicate of ours, the United States of South Africa. It is to be determined whether the gallant Boers shall dedicate the Dark Continent to liberty, as the unclad veterans and heroes of Valley Forge dedicated the North American continent to liberty. It is to be determined whether that great country, capable of sustaining a large population and of becoming a highly civilized State, shall be ruled by a monarchy or by the people themselves. How it could ever have been printed in an American newspaper—how it could ever have been said by a single American statesman—that we desire the subjection of South Africa to a monarchy instead of its dedication to republicanism surpasses my comprehension. How it could ever have been printed in a newspaper or asserted by an American that, in the event that Europe should seek to interfere to prevent this unholy sacrifice, we would be at England's side, I cannot understand. But it has been said. It has not been disclaimed in high circles, and it is believed in London. Is there a neighborhood in the United States of America where Tories outnumber patriots? And we are to have an alliance with Great Britain, it is said! Washington's Farewell Address is no longer to be considered. How would it have done to have had an alliance with some great Power in 1812? British men-of-war stopped American ships on the high seas, searched them, and took off British subjects who had been naturalized and thereby had become citizens of this country. How did they justify that proceeding? They said then that a British subject could not so expatriate himself

as to avoid allegiance to the British Crown—and on that pretense went to war with a feeble Republic; a Republic almost fresh from the bloody war of the Revolution; a Republic that, had it been possible, they would then have reduced to the condition to which they now desire to reduce Africa. They claimed that no British subject could expatriate himself and become a citizen of another country in order to escape the obligations of British citizenship—and on that pretense searched our ships. That was when they wanted to fight this Republic. What is their contention in South Africa? They now contend that, when British subjects seek to expatriate themselves and become citizens of a foreign country, if they will only appeal to the mother land, the British will go, sword in hand, and compel such change of the law as will permit it. And this is the "mother of civilization!"

Leaving out of the account those strictly English colonies, Australia and Canada, where has Great Britain promoted civilization? Has she promoted it in India? Cast your eyes to Ireland, the most fertile and beautiful island in all the world—an island whose acres teem with plenty and the hearts of whose people pulsate with song: the unhappy island that for eight hundred years has trodden the stony path of despair with streaming eyes and bleeding feet—and answer the question. The blessings of civilization are everywhere else; yet the scattered sons of Erin, wherever they are, feel as I feel, as one of their defenders—accursed be the power that has spread the desolation of the desert and the gloom of the grave throughout that most fertile country!

Under what conditions does England become the promoter of civilization and the guardian of civil liberty? There is Venezuela, a little country with a small population. Several years ago rich gold mines were discovered there. Until this discovery there had never been any controversy about the boundaries. Great Britain soon found out that her territory extended far enough to take in those mines, and it required an uprising in the United States to prevent England from taking those rich possessions; yet by an arbitration that was disgraceful they did obtain a very large slice of Venezuelan gold mines.



We bought Alaska from the Czar. There was never any controversy about the location of the boundary line until some gold mines were discovered; and it is a crying shame that Great Britain immediately transferred that boundary line so as to include a large part of the territory undoubtedly American, took possession of it, policed it, and has required American miners to pay a toll for going into it ever since. And the present Administration have said that somehow they are going to settle that—some time!

There never was any attempt to interfere with the Transvaal or the Orange Free State after England acknowledged their independence, about fifty years ago—until the diamond mines were discovered along the edge of the latter. Forthwith this "civilizing" nation moved its boundary just far enough to take in the Orange Free State's mines; and when the enormity of the crime was denounced by the Bishops of the Church, by English statesmen, and by the enlightened press of the world, instead of making restitution of a piece of property worth millions of dollars thus stolen by the freebooters who are at the bottom of the movement to crush South Africa, they actually paid the Orange Free State \$450,000. A great nation commits larceny and then pays one cent on the dollar! The next day it takes up the cheerful song that what it is aiming at in South Africa is liberty and civilization.

A little later the gold mines were discovered there. The exploitation of those mines was somewhat experimental at first, and the tax imposed by the Transvaal government for the occupation of what has proved to be the most lucrative property in the world was placed at one-sixth of what the American miners now pay the British government for the privilege of mining in the Klondike. At first the output of the mines was small; yet none of the miners thought they were being robbed. Then the output got larger, and the poor, despised Uitlanders—who, in the language of the great Boer, Joubert, had obtained fortunes larger than any Boer had or ever will have, by being oppressed—discovered that the taxation was very high. And yet it is said that more money has been made out of the diamond and gold mines of South Africa

by British financiers, during the period in which they have worked those mines, than ever was derived from the mining operations of Christendom before.

In every quarter of the world evidences multiply that capitalism and government are in partnership. When even the American people give voice to the virtuous sentiments of the masses of this civilized century, the whisperings of avarice are more potent with Cabinets; consequently, greed, and not the best motives of mankind, control governmental policies. The real battle in South Africa, therefore, is this: It is an effort to place that country in the keeping and control of the men who operate the mines at Johannesburg and Kimberley. It is an effort to tear from the hands of the men who erected them, and defended them with their lives, the little republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, to the end that capitalism may reign supreme, answerable only to the Cabinet sitting in London—a Cabinet frequently of its own creation. Everything sacred to humanity, every interest dear to mankind, every stake worth the consideration of patriots the world over, is involved in the tragic struggle now taking place in the mountain range that separates the Transvaal and the Orange Free State from their enemies. On Spion Kop the battle of liberty was fought, with a result that rang throughout the world.

I confess that when the gallant Boers—barely half a million—took sword in hand to array themselves against the great Empire, having a population of four hundred millions and possessing probably one-half of all the wealth of the world, I felt there was no chance of success; but in the shock I experienced at the sacrifice about to be made I prayed that at least they might carry on the war long enough to deter England from similar enterprises elsewhere.

In the results of the battles fought in that far-away land we have renewed cause to thank Providence that Utopia is eternal. We have occasion to rejoice and have a right to expect that, no matter how stern the duty devolving upon men made of the stuff that expelled Philip, that drove out Louis XIV., that thwarted the purposes of Marlborough, nothing is

impossible to this race. And it is something to be thankful for that past experience has given them courage. Let us hope, therefore, that the cause of liberty, not the cause of tyranny, will achieve the victory in this unholy war.

Everywhere, in every age, under every form of government, the issue is the same. It is a struggle between concentrated power, in one form or another, and the segregated masses of society. Political power, financial power, incorporated greed—whatever form it may take, the bounden duty of enlightened citizenship is everywhere to call it to account. The function and office of a democratic people are to see to it that they lend no help to the consolidation of forces, here or elsewhere, that are dangerous to popular liberty.

If the Boer people can overthrow the English armies and maintain their integrity, despite this awful assault upon their liberty—if they can achieve a victory in this cruel and unhappy hour—it will be a demonstration that government of the people, by the people, and for the people has been planted in South Africa—there to remain to bless the people. If, on the other hand, the tyrant shall gain temporary ascendancy, the battle of liberty will not have been lost. South Africa is peopled by men of Dutch blood and Dutch courage. One defeat will not overthrow their determination to be free; and while the sacrifice may be one that will appal mankind—while the triumph of such wickedness may cause the weak-hearted to despair of the future—still, the human race ever dries the tear-drops of its sorrows in the sunlight of its hopes, and the love of liberty and willingness to fight and die for its achievement will live as long as men and women live to indulge the dream of freedom. Let us as Americans send a message of good cheer and encouragement to this struggling people; let us give the lie to the brazen charge that in this country, the land of liberty and the home of the Republic, the inspiration and the hope of the world, there is sympathy for the atrocious crime committed against liberty in this unholy crusade!

CHARLES F. COCHRAN.

*Washington, D. C.*

## MONROE DOCTRINE REPEAL AND "OUR NEXT WAR."

ABOUT the middle of July, 1898, an interesting item from a leading French journal was cabled to the American press. The Powers were said to be considering the policy of eventual intervention in the Philippines. Of their right to do so they seemed to feel no doubt. That right was the "logical outcome," so ran the despatch, "of the Monroe Doctrine, the principle of which will be employed by Europe to protect itself against American interference in the Old World."

The inconsistency between Asiatic annexation and the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine had engaged the writer's attention some time before the appearance of the article just quoted. In a little pamphlet\* he aimed to show that the Monroe Doctrine of "America for Americans" inevitably implies Europe for Europeans and Asia for the Asiatics. Whether or not this view be correct is immaterial; indeed, what our own people may think about it is not very important. The European point of view is the one that concerns us; for obviously, if the other Powers deem Manila and Monroe Doctrine to be radically inconsistent, we may be drifting faster than we at all realize toward what has lately been called "our next war."

There has been a good deal of drift already—and drift at so momentous a period hardly seems the right attitude. Nor will it serve to fall back supinely upon that much-abused word "destiny." Doubtless there is a Providence that shapes the path of men and nations, but all the rough hewing (which is certainly not drift) is left to mankind.

As to this European feeling, no room is left for doubt. No sooner did the cession of the Philippines make its appearance among the articles of the treaty with Spain than the foreign

---

\*A monograph published in New York by the Robert Lewis Weed Company, entitled "Manila or Monroe Doctrine?"

press opened in full cry and on the same key. "The Monroe Doctrine is now out of date," a leading French paper is quoted as saying in the despatches of November 30, 1898. "The American Republic, conquering and colonizing, has no longer the right to close to Europe the new continent, since she has herself stepped outside of it." An equally prominent journal of France observes: "The transatlantic democracy has become imperialistic, and a republic founded on federalism has become a conquering one. From an international point of view this means a repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine." The German papers of the same date argue that so far only "international jealousies have prevented Europe from opposing the excessive demands of the Americans," especially "the annexation of the Philippines." On November 30 it was cabled from Paris: "There is no denying that the whole European continent will bitterly resent the American acquisition of the Philippines. As a high French official said to-day, 'the appearance of the Americans in Eastern waters is a disturbing element to the whole of Europe.'" Mr. W. E. Stead, who has just returned from a tour of France, Germany, Belgium, Russia, Austria, Turkey, and Italy, said to a correspondent of the Associated Press: "Outside of England I have not seen a single non-American who was not opposed to the expansion of America. Nor through my whole tour of Europe have I met a European who did not receive the protestations of the genuine sincerity with which Americans entered upon the war with more or less mockery or incredulity." About a month later appeared the article in the Russian journal *Novoe Vremya*, which attracted so much attention as indicating that Russia was beginning a campaign against the Nicaragua canal. "Forgetting the Monroe Doctrine of 'America for the Americans,' which implies the other doctrine that Asiatic dominion must be confined to Asiatics, the Yankees are now entering into open competition with us in China and Corea," observes *Novoe Vremya*. Hence Russian diplomats and financiers are urged to support the Panama canal as against the Nicaraguan, since the former will be a French, or at least an international, enterprise.



Despite the ambiguous position, however, that we now occupy in the eyes of the world, it cannot be seriously imagined that we intend to abandon the Doctrine. The very suggestion some time ago drew from a prominent organ of "expansion" this vigorous disclaimer: "Our people are practically a unit for the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, and are ready to resent in arms the attempt of any European power to occupy any part of the American continents." If such is the case, what becomes of the singular plea put forth in some quarters that the Doctrine has of late grown obsolete? On the contrary, the immense impulse the war has given to Monroeism ought to be sufficiently obvious. By the acquisition of Cuba, whether in fee or in trust, of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, we have now become open not merely to coast attack, as heretofore, but to invasion of our territory. And in case of war, if twenty-five or fifty thousand Frenchmen or Germans should effect a landing in Cuba or Puerto Rico, at what an outpouring of blood and treasure must the invader be expelled! Then there is the canal that is to link our east and west coasts together. Dispute of our control of this waterway by Europe would be most repugnant to the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine—far more so than foreign aggression could have been before we possessed so vulnerable a point of attack.

There is nothing in Monroeism, however, and nothing that has appeared in the foreign press that limits our right to restore law and order in the Philippines; to indemnify ourselves so far as possible for the sacrifices made; to secure tariff, trading and coaling concessions; or even to sell our right and title if we so desire, under certain safeguards and restrictions. But permanent occupation is a vastly different matter, and it is to permanent occupation that many of our statesmen would finally commit us while they talk of "destiny" or "duty." Yet no duties at Manila can possibly compare with those nearer home—those paramount duties to ourselves and our children, to our neighbors, to our continent, and to the Powers of the Old World that we deliberately assumed when we planted our feet in the paths marked out by Jefferson, Madison, and

Monroe. It is these duties that, as we have seen, all the Powers of Europe believe we mean to trample under foot in our invasion of Asia. England seems no exception to the rule. But a short time ago the *Saturday Review* advised the British government that, as we were evidently preparing to stay in Asia and had thereby repealed the Monroe Doctrine, England should seize the first opportunity that might present itself to take control of South America. When that opportunity shall come, it would be interesting to know what line our diplomats will take. In case of the Germans, with whom our gallant but hot-headed soldiers or sailors are predicting "the next war" is to be, our future policy must be a matter of even greater concern.

Suppose we look at the case a moment through Teutonic spectacles. In 1885 Germany had some thoughts of buying Cuba from Spain. On sounding our government, however, she was informed in effect that the cloak of the Monroe Doctrine covered both of these continents from the Arctic to Cape Horn, and that the Old World Powers were expected to confine themselves to their hemisphere, just as we had confined ourselves to our own. In 1898 Germany, which has recently bought the Carolines of Spain, was apparently planning to acquire the Philippines also. But just then we ourselves broke in on the scene and secured the prize. That the German attitude was unfriendly for a time is not to be denied. Most of our leaders of public opinion and all the imperialists felt, or affected, much surprise and indignation. Of course we had a right to conclude our campaign without hindrance and to restore law and order in the islands. But while tenacious of *our* rights, the "expansionist" from the start has shown a truly imperial disregard for the rights of others and entirely ignored the *international* issue. His answer to that argument—what little was heard of it—and to many others has been, "The flag must never come down!"—just as he now claims that we have gone too far under *his* guidance to retreat.

Before our isthmian canal is built, Germany may wish to purchase the island of St. Thomas from Denmark, or acquire

some other foothold on or near the canal route. There has been talk of it already. The building and defense of that outlying canal and the possession of islands in the Gulf make the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine more vital than ever before in our history—of infinitely more value to the country than the Philippines can ever be, plus all the treasure we have spent or may spend there, and all of Australasia thrown in. But if we stay in Asia, on what ground shall we oppose the transfer of St. Thomas to Germany? On the ground of the Monroe Doctrine especially revived for the occasion? If so, we can hardly wonder that even the friendly Mr. Stead, who like most Englishmen wants us to remain in the Orient, admits that in all Europe he found no man who did not receive the claim of American sincerity and good faith "with mockery and incredulity." Thanks to imperialism, we threaten soon to bestride the earth like a double-faced Colossus, proclaiming to the bewildered Powers: "One law for us, another for you; a Monroe Doctrine for the New World but none for the Old!" This is a far more arrogant position than even England—our imperialist model—ever assumed; and the foreign despatches for weeks have been reflecting all Europe's fear and hatred of English imperialism. So our own imperialists, England's avowed disciples in this respect, will, if we let them, earn for us the undying hate and eventual opposition of European as well as Asiatic.

So far as Germany is concerned, the very recent signs of an *understanding* by the Administration with Germany and England will doubtless be the answer made to any prophet of future trouble for us on this continent with either Power. But such an answer is extremely superficial. No mortal man, not even the most skilled diplomatist, can foretell how long the German Emperor will maintain his present apparently friendly attitude. But a short time ago he was sending telegrams to South Africa that set England ablaze with resentment. The natural enmity of German to Russian may be great, but it can hardly exceed that of German to Briton. "Ignotus," in the *National Review* of August, 1899, and the author of "The

Arch Enemy of England" in the *Contemporary Review* of December, 1898, are but two of various writers to point out clear evidence of a recent combination of Germany and other European powers to overmatch England on the sea and then appropriate her colonies. "The prevention of intervention of European Powers in favor of a weaker [Spain], by the aid of the enormous sea power of one nation [England], and the impossibility of interference when America took not only the West Indian but also the far Asiatic possessions of Spain, are sufficient reasons for a much larger German navy." Such is the official statement of the German administrative organ, and the attention of our own Administration is respectfully drawn to its date—November 4, 1899—some time *after* the first German overtures to England and America.

The combination against England of a year or two ago may or may not exist to-day, but it is certainly liable to spring into existence at any time from an increased German navy or from the ever-shifting relations of the great Powers. From their ceaseless turmoils and hopeless perplexities this country always has and always should hold aloof. Any leaning toward "entangling alliances" is as foolish and reckless to-day as it was a century ago, and it is just as impossible now as then to rely on the motive of the ally or the permanence of the alliance. Indeed, one of the insurmountable objections to *staying in Asia* is the need of an "understanding" in order to *maintain ourselves* while the understanding lasts, and the certainty of a conflict *both on that continent and on this* whenever the inevitable *misunderstanding* comes.

These considerations are too important longer to ignore or brush aside. They are of vastly more concern to the Republic than even the Philippine war, whether that be concluded this spring or prolonged for years to come. If we had only been given a chance to discuss at the outset the international factor of our Asiatic problem, it would have been a far simpler one; but we can still find in the Monroe Doctrine a clew that may lead us to the way out of this labyrinth.

As for those of our gallant officers who seem to favor retain-

ing the islands at all costs, it is time to remind ourselves that outside of military matters a military man is not apt to prove a safe or reliable guide. What the country sorely needs is firm and far-sighted statesmanship, and immediate recognition at home as well as abroad of all that Monroeism implies and involves. What party or association will have the courage, honesty, and patriotism to insist that no policy be adopted in the East that shall in any wise impair, imperil, or compromise the ever-essential principles of the Monroe Doctrine?

JOHN CHETWOOD.

*San Francisco, Cal.*

## BRITISH RADICALS AND RADICALISM.

**I**F we were to eliminate from English history all those who in their generations were looked upon as radicals and iconoclasts we should have a series of *lacunæ* in the record of that upward movement by which man in the British Islands has risen from a lower to a higher level. Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, Joseph Hume, and William Molesworth, together with the gentler individuality of George Grote, would have to be erased. The fine, chivalric personality of John Stuart Mill (whom we of to-day have ceased to regard as so very extreme a radical) would also have to be expunged. Most of these men were political Ishmaelites in their day whom neither of the two great political divisions cared to shelter. Their names were linked in much of the popular imagination with those of undoubted demagogues and charlatans.

The names of political parties in Great Britain mean hardly more than they do here. "Liberal" and "Conservative" are the convenient designations of political tendencies rather than of political divisions. The Liberal party is usually found a step or two in advance of the Conservative party during any particular phase in the evolution of a reform principle, but this is only a temporary relation of politics and by no means a permanent difference of apprehension. The Liberals have given to Ireland some of the most unpopular Chief Secretaries, such as Mr. William E. Forster; they have adopted as rigorous measures of coercion for Ireland as the Conservatives, and have repeatedly stood as opponents of measures of relief for the working masses, basing such opposition, it may be said in justification, on the *laissez faire* doctrines of the Manchester school. Outside of the two parties, the Radicals have heated and hammered the iron of reform into small swords, which they have placed now in the hands of Joseph Chamberlain or the late Lord Randolph Churchill, and now of Gladstone or Sir William Harcourt. The Radicals have been the advance guard



of the great siege that is being waged against privilege, leaving the fruit and the loot of such victories as have been won to the Liberal army; and this in spite of the fact that many of the Radicals were stanch supporters of the main purposes and policies of the government. It is true that Mr. Labouchere was nominated for office by Mr. Gladstone; but the Queen would not assent, and his name was promptly withdrawn.

The Liberals when in power have not seldom emulated the Tories in retroactive measures, while the Tories out of power have nearly as often favored the enactment of Liberal measures. When, for example, the rumor of Irish-American plots—mostly rumor and nothing more—led Sir William Harcourt to introduce a bill strengthening the Explosives Act, Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords declared that no real reason existed for its passage. Lord Randolph Churchill in the very heart of the Conservative organization built up his Tory Democracy. The bulk of factory laws are the offspring of Tory, not of Liberal, legislation.

It was the merest accident that determined the place of Disraeli in the Conservative party. He was least of all a Conservative. His dream of Imperial federation likens him to James G. Blaine, and he was popular with the masses for the same reason that Mr. Blaine was. By a like accident of politics Parnell was forced to act with the Liberal party, with which he was nowise in sympathy; for neither by temperament nor conviction was Parnell a democrat. It is well known that for the land doctrines of Michael Davitt, which were those identified in America with the teachings of Henry George, he had declared his abhorrence. In the old days Joseph Chamberlain was called a Radical, but a great change has come over Mr. Chamberlain. No one has departed more widely from the course of those brave declarations that in his earlier Parliamentary career, as the political partner of that still uncompromising Radical and far greater man, Sir Charles Dilke, he used as a stepping-stone to his present high official pedestal. All the vices that Mr. Chamberlain, when he was a Radical, attributed to the Tories, he has industriously practised since his conver-

sion to Toryism. There were occasions when he accused the Tories of purposely complicating foreign affairs that attention might be diverted from questions at home. To-day he belittles every home question, applying to it the term "parochial," and insisting that the only questions of permanent interest to the United Kingdom are its foreign and colonial problems. As Lord Salisbury ridiculed "the policy of taking the public into the confidence of the government on the delicate questions that concern foreign and colonial policy," the question arises whether it is the government's intention hopelessly to distract and befog the British people.

To-day this policy governs the Salisbury ministry in the treatment of the Transvaal question. The government is on the eve of dissolution. Domestic problems are pressing to the fore. Almost every by-election has of late resulted in overwhelming Liberal victory. The Conservatives dare not "go to the country" on their record, and especially they dare not face the new questions that are pressing for solution. Mr. Chamberlain is a good politician in the measure of his unscrupulousness. His record—or shall I say his records, since the versatility of his career has identified him with a greater variety of policies than fall to the fortune of most public men with whom politics is a trade rather than a conviction?—has been such as to render him a thorn in the side of the party that adopted him. His Radical atavism they look upon as likely to manifest itself at any time, and of this his party associates stand in wholesome dread.

The preposterous demands of British Imperialism are deliberately adopted as a party policy to avoid the alternative of meeting defeat at the polls. For this policy the Colonial Secretary is responsible. It has been adopted with a twofold purpose: the one that has been stated and another, which is to gain the consent of the English people to increased armaments that the program of British Imperialism may be perfected with additions.

The independence of the Transvaal after the British defeats at Lang's Neck and Majuba Hill was given back to the sturdy

Boers, subject to an indeterminate and cloudy power of suzerainty by the British Crown. By the Convention of 1884 the independence of the Colony received additional confirmation. The name of the South African Republic was bestowed upon it, and its geographical limits were defined. In 1894 the Dutch colony absorbed part of the Zulu country, and to such annexation England offered no objection, though territorial additions have from "immemorial time" been regarded as the highest exercise of the sovereign power of a people. The claim of British suzerainty is thus reduced to a shadowy and unsubstantial pretense. But the Colonial Secretary seeks to construe it to mean a right of dictation to the Volksraad in purely domestic matters—and this in violation of England's most solemn pledges. But to this policy the English Radicals will certainly be opposed with united front; and it is not impossible that the versatile Colonial Secretary has committed the last great blunder of his political career. From the intrepid, public-spirited mayor of Birmingham, having to his credit an administration of public affairs that raised that municipality to a proud eminence among cities of the English-speaking world, to the "jingo" politician goading with bullying threats a brave people into resentment, is a contrast happily not often met with in the lives of men of undoubted qualities of intellect and capacity for public affairs.

The British "jingo" politicians perhaps base too much confidence in the excitableness of the London populace. The cable has told American readers of peace meetings interrupted and disorganized by Chamberlain sympathizers, and of soldiers carried on the shoulders of the mob at Trafalgar Square. But British Imperialism is always more noisy than the opposition, and such boisterous demonstrations are apt to be short lived. The natural bent of the English mind is toward conservatism, and the smothering of the maniacal patient under the cold blanket of reason and calculation is likely to put an end to the paroxysms.

Not all men who call themselves Radicals are such. John Stuart Mill has told us some men were Radicals because

they were not Lords. Many well-known Radicals broke away from Mr. Gladstone, so shocked were their sensitive natures by the Irish Home Rule bill. Mere denunciations of social conditions have long ceased in English politics sharply to define Radical from Conservative. Nor should the Socialistic movement be confounded with the Radical movement in Great Britain. The former is the survival of extinct Chartism, with all the Chartist incoherence; the other is a more or less legitimate successor of that impulse started by Cobden and Bright with the abolition of the Corn Laws, and vaguely foreshadowed in the speeches of some of the great free traders. Careless or ill-informed writers sometimes confound Radicalism with Socialism; but this is not true of Radicalism, of either the British or generic kind. It is largely because British Radicalism recognizes the evils of State interference that it favors disestablishment, home rule for Ireland, and the taxation of ground rents and land values—the latter permitting the abolition of prevailing onerous imposts. Socialists, on the other hand, are often found making party cause with the Conservatives, voting for the continuance of the Established Church and English rule in Ireland and against all progressive measures.

It is not always easy to define what the term *Radical*, as used politically in Great Britain, means. It is first necessary to understand that there is something startlingly frank in the discussion as to whether government by the masses or government by the cultivated classes is best for society. We should shrink from such appalling candor here, because political discussions have less the distinctive mark of sincerity. We veil the same purposes under political euphemisms, but in English politics there is no such dissimulation, speakers of the Conservative party often openly avowing their preference for class government.

One of the chief points of Radical attack in the past has been the House of Lords. The anomalous position of that body in the scheme of British government and its long continuance are a standing wonder to the foreigner, and especially to the

democratic citizen of North America. Fifty years ago and more threats were uttered against the House of Peers. As long ago as 1839 Macaulay prophesied its abolition; but it still continues. To understand this one must understand the English character. Gladstone, had he chosen, might have led a successful attack against it; but Gladstone in all essential things was English—nay, for thirty years *was* England. A campaign against the Lords could wait. It will be remembered that Mr. Gladstone adopted the principle of Home Rule only when it was absolutely demonstrated by the election of 1884 that the majority of the Irish people were in favor of such a policy. The time has not come when England is prepared to sacrifice the House of Lords. There are many reasons for this long sufferance, after allowing for the conservatism of the British intellect. In British politics nothing transpires suddenly. It will be remembered that the first reform bill was passed in 1832, and it was not until 1867 that the second reform bill, establishing household suffrage in boroughs, was passed. And it was not until seventeen years later, in 1884, that such household suffrage was extended to the counties. The House of Lords has repeatedly disclaimed any intention of setting itself in opposition to the public will, and has thus prolonged its life beyond the allotted span of nineteenth-century anachronisms. Why Mr. Gladstone, at a time when the Liberal atmosphere was heavy and stagnant, did not choose to uplift and purify it by carrying out his threat, uttered with oracular solemnity against the Lords, is a secret now buried in the grave with the superb opportunist. This self-restraint, if a weakness, met with punishment; for the defeat of the Home Rule bill left the Liberals dispirited and without a rallying issue. Such to this day they have remained.

The chief point of Radical attack to-day is not the House of Lords, but the existing land system. Whenever the Liberal party has moved in this direction the Radicals have been a little in advance, or, to speak more accurately, have been close at the rear urging forward the Liberals to measures touching land reform more drastic in effect and more explicit in declaration. It is not to be denied that the influence of the teachings of

Henry George has been strongly felt in the trend of British politics. Davitt in the Irish party has not scrupled to avow his adhesion to these principles; and Sir George Trevelyan, nephew and biographer of Lord Macaulay, is an advocate of the taxation of ground rents and land values—two phases that, suggesting the same thing to the American reader, mean two distinct things to the British mind.

How imminent is the great land question in English politics is shown by a suggestive vote in the Commons a few months ago. A proposition to tax the land values of towns was introduced as an amendment to the Queen's speech by Mr. E. J. C. Morton. It was a bolt out of a clear sky. For the first time since this burning question of the land has entered English politics it came before Parliament in definite shape; for the first time, too, the Liberal party became officially committed, by the action of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in naming the official whips as tellers, to the question that must hereafter determine the rise and fall of parties and Parliamentary ambitions. The government could only muster a majority of thirty-four against the measure, though the normal majority is one hundred and forty. The speeches, notably that of Mr. Fletcher Moulton, were vigorous; and the Commons rang with denunciations of the system that gives to those who do not earn the great public value of the Kingdom.

The land question is indeed coming to the front. "We make the money and they spend it" is a saying of the agricultural laborer, and by "they" are meant the ground landlords of England. Various devices have been adopted to head off this agitation, among which has been the effort to inject tariff discussions into the political arena with the intention of holding out delusive hopes to the agricultural voter.

One of the interesting issues to be decided in the next general Parliamentary election is that which centers around the subject of old-age pensions. On the question itself Conservatives, Liberals, and Radicals are practically agreed; it is on the methods by which the funds to pay these pensions shall be raised that they part company. Curiously enough, to both



Conservatives and Liberals are here presented an opportunity and a danger, in a manner that a few paragraphs may serve to make clear.

It was on August 12th of last year that Mr. Henry Chaplin, in a significant speech, "cast an anchor to windward." He proceeded to condemn as extravagant the estimate of certain newspapers that the old-age pension policy would call for a raising of from twelve to twenty million pounds sterling per annum. It is true that such a sum, Mr. Chaplin intimated, might be raised by a duty of five to ten shillings on foreign corn. But he warned the agricultural community not to be led away by such seductive suggestions (as if, indeed, agriculturists and not landlords could be benefited by such a duty). "But," continued the speaker, "if those who make this proposition will limit themselves to the old shilling duty upon grain, which would not add to the price because its removal did not cause a decline in price—a *non sequitur*, it may be suggested, not identical with demonstration!—it would suffice for a nice little nucleus for old-age pensions." In this way a "sop to Cerberus" was thrown out by the shifty Mr. Chaplin. Of course, these things are hazarded only as "feelers," as our American friends would say. There is no more chance of the reimposition of the grain duty in England than there is of the sea rising and swallowing her up. But the hope of such reimposition lives eternal in the Tory breast.

It is to be noted that such duties are defended, even by the insidious Tory protectionists, always as a revenue measure. But such is the genesis of even the highest tariffs; they are born of a revenue mother into the hands of a protectionist *accoucheur*. The English protectionists sneer at free trade and the "Cobden fetish;" they timidly advance, even while they disavow, the arguments overthrown in 1847, but even while disavowing they talk of a preferential duty of one shilling on all grain from the English colonies and two shillings on grain from Russia and elsewhere. They ask how the pension scheme can be carried out if not by bringing under taxation some article of general consumption. In the answer to this question are in-

volved the opportunity and the danger at which I have hinted. The opportunity for the Conservatives is the drawing of a red herring across the path of the pending question of the taxation of land values; the danger is that in raising the issue of protection in the guise of revenue schemes the Conservatives may conjure a Frankenstein to destroy them. To the Liberals the issue likewise presents a danger and an opportunity. The danger is that they may accept a compromise between the grain duties proposed and the taxation of land values; their opportunity is to raise the true standard of fiscal reform in a general attack all along the line on imperial methods of taxation and to call for the imposition of a direct tax upon the land values of the Kingdom. And for this British, especially Scottish, opinion is fully ripe.

Years ago, when Mr. George's doctrines were first proposed, the Radicals denounced them; yet they were openly accused of harboring them. To-day they have ceased to disavow them. There are certainly over sixty members of the Commons pledged to the principle for which Mr. George stood, and not all of them are Radicals in the party sense. The Radical election for members of the London County Council turned exclusively upon the question of ground rents, and the Progressive Radicals won. In more than one quarter a consciousness has arisen that in dealing with the Irish question the voters are really dealing with the land question. The forcible reduction of Irish rents, too, has familiarized the slow-going English mind with the truth that property in land is not to be regarded with the same sacredness as property in things produced by labor. The Liberal program to-day advocates "the taxation of ground rents, land values, and mining royalties"—a tautological inventory, for the benefit of the popular mind, of one and the same unearned increment.

When in 1880, on the wave of a tremendous majority, the Liberals came back to power with Mr. Gladstone at their head, the Radicals were few in number and lacking in influence. They were utterly without a rallying issue that would close their ranks for defensive or offensive warfare. They were

content to place themselves under the leadership of Mr. Gladstone, though some were looking to Sir Charles Dilke and some to Mr. Chamberlain.

The mention of Sir Charles Dilke calls to mind the leading English Radical of to-day. Years ago he declared himself a republican. With abilities more solid and conspicuous than those of Labouchere, the present member of Parliament for the Forest of Dean is still a large figure in English public life. Stroke oar of Cambridge, Senior in the Law Tripos, with a scholarship in mathematics and the degrees of Bachelor and Master of Laws—these mark his college course; and the immediate after years found him in 1869 and 1870 traveling through the great empire of Russia and observing with a keen and philosophic eye all that was unrolled in the panorama before him. How closely he observes, and with what power of analysis he scrutinizes and dissects, readers of "Greater Britain" can testify. This work, written during his tour around the world in 1866-7, will remain as one of the literary masterpieces of the time. The success it achieved was instantaneous. Sir Charles was a very young man at that time, which increases the marvel of this achievement, for the thought is ripened and matured. Young Dilke had been brought up surrounded by every luxury, under the guardianship of a perhaps too indulgent father, his mother having died while he was yet a child; but he was possessed of studious inclinations and a love for outdoor sports, and his habits thus conduced to the ideal of "a sound mind in a sound body."

There was a time when Sir Charles was accustomed to hearing himself introduced to British audiences as "the future Prime Minister of England." This was when he and Mr. Chamberlain were political partners, and when the two were dividing between them nearly all the public attention that Gladstone was not reserving for himself. The first of his public utterances that singled him out from the tribe of smaller politicians was his famous speech at Tyneside on "The Cost of the Crown," in which, with extraordinary fluency and humor, he went into the expense entailed on the people by the long line

of royal functionaries—Rat Catcher in Ordinary, Grand Falconer to Her Majesty, and other dignitaries attached to the retinue of her royal person. The speech was particularly audacious, but rather tickled the British people as its humor slowly percolated. The chief merit of the speech was that there was no possible reply to it.

Sir Charles has two styles of speaking—a Parliamentary and a platform style. We hear less of the latter than of the former nowadays from Dilke. A Parliamentary career does not conduce to effective public speaking. Eloquence has a subordinate place in the House of Commons. What the House does appreciate, and what the party following in the country does expect from its favorite in the House, is adequate strength in debate. There is just enough of the belligerent in the British nature to be on the lookout for an intellectual tussle; and this the elector anticipates and is disappointed if he does not get. But men who have been long in Parliament and who venture to address public audiences are almost sure to fail in arousing strong public sentiment, because a certain impassivity has become a House of Commons habit. With Dilke this is very marked. He can and does say the sharpest and most cutting things; but his extraordinary deliberation of manner, reenforced by the Parliamentary habit, gives to his utterances an effect not a little queer. These bitter things are said with inconceivable decorum; but there is always evidence of the orderly mind. Sir Charles's mental housekeeping is of the neatest. His answers to questions are said to be equal to those of any public man in England, and he ranks to-day as the greatest Parliamentary authority on the British navy.

Not every member, nor perhaps even a majority of the Irish Home Rulers, are Radicals in either the real or party sense. I have indicated that Mr. Parnell was not—that the whole bent of his mind was toward conservatism. The same is true of the present Irish Home Rulers. Of these Michael Davitt is a Radical in every physical and moral fiber. He has suffered, too, for his convictions. In 1870, on the charge of treason-felony, he was condemned to fifteen years' penal servitude and served

ten years. Since then he has been imprisoned several times for seditious speeches. In 1879, in association with Mr. Parnell, he founded the Land League organization, and in 1884 he published his well-known "Leaves from a Prison Diary." Davitt alone of the Irish leaders, as I have said, has radical views on the land question; he would use the taxing power to destroy land monopoly.

It is small wonder that this Irishman grew up with a hatred of landlordism. When young Davitt was a mere baby in arms, his father, in the county of Mayo in which Davitt was born, was evicted from the little plot of land that constituted the family's sole subsistence. When a boy he went to work in a mill, and there lost his arm. At fifteen years of age he became a letter-carrier. When a young man Davitt was a Fenian, and moreover a Fenian conspirator. He has never denied it; indeed, he is rather proud of it. But he has come to take a different and a nobler view of things. In the letter he wrote after the murder of Burke and Cavendish he said, freely: "This let me say for myself: If, in the hot blood of early manhood, smarting under the cruelties and indignities perpetrated on my country, I saw in an appeal to force the only means of succoring her, there has dawned upon my graver thoughts, in the bitter solitude of a felon's cell, a nobler vision—a dream of the enfranchisement and fraternization of peoples, of the conquering of hate by justice."

Although Parnell condemned the land theories of Davitt, yet the latter has lived to see the Parnell idea overthrown, and the narrow principle in the party policy of Irishmen invoked with such masterfulness and carried so near to achievement as far away as ever. There are but few men in England, and but fewer still of the Irish leaders, in whose efforts public opinion believes that personal ambition has no place. Yet Davitt has come to be so regarded. Of late, it must be confessed, he has not seemed to perceive so clearly all that is involved in a real and final settlement of the land question. I say this not because of any public declaration that Davitt has made, but for the reason that within the present year there has been organized

in Ireland the United Irish League, in which Michael Davitt is one of the chief leaders, and the published program of which shows but an imperfect and halting conception of the land rights of the people of Ireland. Two clauses, the second and third of the constitution, are appended, which advocate:

"The abolition of landlordism in Ireland by means of a universal and compulsory system of purchase of the landlord's interest, together with the reinstatement of tenants evicted in connection with the land war, and the restoration, to the legal status of tenancy, of caretakers and future tenants whose rights were sacrificed by the operation of the 7th section of the Land Act of 1887.

"The putting an end to agricultural distress and famine in the West by abolishing, on terms of just compensation to all interests affected, the unnatural system by which all the richest acres of the province are monopolized by a small ring of graziers, and restoring to the people the occupation of these lands in holdings of sufficient size and quality."

That such a program, involving as it does radical imperfections from a practical standpoint, and worse defects from the standpoint of principle, should be associated with the name of Michael Davitt will surprise all of his friends on this side of the water who know him best. He, better than most men, should know the futility, injustice, and impolicy of the allotment system, or of legal limitations of land-holding. Either the land of Ireland belongs to all the people of Ireland or it does not. If it does, the proposed system of compulsory purchase is what kindred measures have long been known to be—"a landlords' relief bill," and a contemptuous impertinence addressed to the intelligence of the taxpayers; but if it does not, then do such limitations as are suggested transgress the most sacred rights of property. And of this no one is more fully aware than Michael Davitt.

Of the Radical representatives of labor in Parliament who are not Socialists the most eminent is Thomas Burt, miners' representative of one of the divisions of Northumberland. He has been in Parliament since 1874, and is the son of a miner and a miners' representative in the House. He has been present at



all the Miners' International Conferences, has written much, and is one of the strongest political forces in public life. He began working in the coal mines at ten years of age. In 1892 Mr. Gladstone invited him to become Parliamentary secretary to the Board of Trade, a position that Mr. Burt accepted.

Among Radicals not in official life is Edward Evans, jr., one of the real leaders of the Liberal party. He is vice-president of the Liberal Federation. He is a young man—young as English politicians go, being only about forty years of age.

Among Scotch Radicals the most prominent is Sir Charles Cameron, M.P. Sir Charles was created a baronet for his services in inaugurating the six-penny telegraph system. It is interesting to know that he had to fight for years to accomplish a reform that seems to embody so little. He was also successful in championing the cause of municipal suffrage for women in Scotland. He is the proprietor of the *North British Daily Mail* and the *Glasgow Weekly Mail*, which has the largest circulation of any weekly journal in Scotland. Another Scotch Radical is Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Bart., M.P., Liberal party leader. There was a time when all parties would have united upon him for Speaker despite his well-known Radicalism; for he is quite as famous for his judicial temperament. He has the fashion of uttering the most audacious and far-reaching sentiments in the coldest-blooded and most matter-of-fact way. He is a large landlord of city property. He has represented Stirling since 1868, and was Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1884-5. He was educated at the University of Glasgow and at Trinity College, Cambridge. It was the adverse reception given to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's motion to dispense with the Duke of Cambridge's services in the army that in 1895 led to the dissolution of Parliament and the resignation of the Liberal leaders.

Wales numbers thirty members in the House, and nearly all are Radicals. Of these David Lloyd George is one of the most hopeful. But to Alfred Thomas is due the credit of having formed the Welsh party in the House in the last few months. He and many of the others hold advanced doctrines on the

land question. Mr. Thomas has represented Glamorganshire since 1885, and is about sixty years old; he is a prominent and successful merchant, and was president of the Baptist Union of Wales and at one time Mayor of Cardiff. Wales is, of course, overwhelmingly Non-conformist, and the threat of the House of Lords to defeat the Welsh Disestablishment bill will have the effect of uniting the Welsh members against the Upper House when the clock of doom shall strike for that body.

Not only because of his position as president of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, of which Gladstone's brother was the first president, does Edmund Knowles Muspratt deserve a distinguished place among the Radical leaders. He is one the greatest living authorities on taxation in the United Kingdom. He is the head of a great firm of alkali manufacturers with headquarters at Liverpool, but in spite of large business interests he has been active in more than one movement for the betterment of the lives of his fellows. The Financial Reform Association has done great work in fiscal reform, and of this organization Mr. Muspratt has been an active member for forty years and president for twenty-six. He was born in 1833 and studied in Germany under Baron Liebig.

John Ferguson, a publisher and stationer in Glasgow, is one of the founders of the Scottish Land Restoration League and an eloquent and persuasive orator. The Irish Nationalist movement found in him an earnest advocate, and the advanced position that the Glasgow Council has lately taken in promoting a bill in Parliament to give power to municipalities to tax land values is due in no small measure to the work of John Ferguson.

W. H. Lever is an English Radical and an energetic business man whose "Sunlight Soap" is known all over Great Britain. He has two factories, one at Birkenhead and one in Australia. He contested Birkenhead, a Tory stronghold, and brought down a Conservative majority of two thousand to one hundred.

W. P. Byles, proprietor of the *Bradford Observer*, of which his father was the founder, is a man of singular independence of character—and is thus not popular with the party managers,

though looked up to with admiration and respect by the people, and especially by the laboring people, whose cause he has so loyally championed. He is the only employer of labor in Bradford who appeared on the platform during the engineers' strike to defend the union's position. In 1892 he won his seat in Parliament. He is a strong advocate of international arbitration and the reduction of armaments. Mr. Byles is a brave, consistent friend of freedom, one of the many who are helping to bring the English people and all mankind up out of the darkness of social slavery into the light of liberty. J. McGuffin Greaves, who conducts the public debates on market-days in the city of Manchester, is one of the best informed men in Great Britain and one of the most representative of non-official Radicals. J. W. S. Callie, who is editor of the "Financial Reform Almanack"—the Radical Bible—and secretary of the Financial Reform Association, is a strong man in the Radical party. So, too, is Sir George Newnes, proprietor of *The Strand* and *Tit-Bits*, who has served in Parliament; and Sir John Lang, M.P., proprietor of the Dundee *Advertiser*. There are three miners' representatives in the Commons from whom, when the Radical tide shall have risen higher, the world may hear more—Charles Fenwick, Sam Woods, and John Wilson. Richard McGhee, M.P., is a land restorationist and a rugged, fearless type of man. Augustine Birrell, M.P., the well-known author of "Obiter Dicta," one of the most skilful and original of critics, with a style that fairly radiates with epigram and humor, is a far more robust Radical than one expects to find among members of the higher literary craft. Labouchere is of course too well known to need introduction to American readers. His most grave defect, perhaps, is his absence of seriousness. More even than the Americans, the English distrust humor as a quality in their public men.

These are a few of the men that are shaping Radical political thought in Great Britain. A great many others, not usually considered Radicals, are doing as much. But a few months have gone by since John Morley announced himself as an advocate of the recovery of all rights in land. How the land question is looming up in British politics may be seen from

this declaration, issued with the approval of the National Liberal Federation:

"Lord Salisbury constitutes himself the spokesman of a class—of the class to which he himself belongs—who toil not, neither do they spin; whose fortunes, as in his case, originated in grants made long ago for such services as courtiers render kings, and have since grown and increased, while their owners slept, by the levy of an unearned share on all that other men have done by toil and labor to add to the general wealth and prosperity of the country of which they form a part."

But political issues in Great Britain are only shaping themselves. Both Liberals and Conservatives are without a definite program, and the Radicals are not less so. It would not even be possible to state the exact issue upon which the last general Parliamentary elections of 1895 were decided. But the great, overshadowing, and everywhere impending question is that of *man's equal rights to the land* of Great Britain. When this issue comes we may expect many of the Liberals, and perhaps even some of the Radicals, to fall away. All the Socialists will certainly do so—but, intellectually and numerically, the Socialists are of small importance. I would exempt, however, from such depreciatory estimate many of the Fabians, since men like Bernard Shaw are of them; but the Fabians themselves seem to me, with their lack of vitality and want of robust appreciation of what is really the matter with society, a thin and shadowy group—the very pre-Raphaelites of political economy. I do not doubt the earnestness of these mild and inoffensive teachers any more than I do the appalling length of their social program. But for all practical purposes—in the gathering impetus of that movement of social reform destined to destroy in both English-speaking countries those systems that oppress man, produce inequalities, and turn the very agencies of civilization to its own destruction—Socialism is even of less importance than the fabled fly upon the chariot wheel. For the fly does survive after all these centuries in a story that illustrates its moral; but for the ephemera of economic error who dare predict a like longevity?

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

*New York City.*

## THE SUPREME COURT IN HISTORY.

LATE attacks upon popular government, originating with European monarchical thinkers, appear to justify a new analysis of the American system. At the beginning of the twentieth century we have still to meet certain fundamental questions involving the success of democratic government. Monarchists are now able to bring into the field of discussion a very different class of advocates and defenders from those of the earlier days of our Republic. Mr. W. E. H. Lecky and Sir Henry Maine believe that they can prove by the history of the last seventy-five years that England has been better governed than the United States. Victoria has shown us monarchy at its best; have we shown popular government at its best? We must demonstrate, and not assert. John Adams said: "All governments are of one, of a few, or of all; and we believe the latter, although attended with evils, the safest." Was this a correct diagnosis? The recent Procurator of the Holy Synod of Russia, Mr. K. P. Pobyedonosteff, in his "Reflections of a Russian Statesman," speaks of democracy as "the malady of our time." His book is a daring challenge to the advocates of popular government. Meanwhile Herbert Spencer goes back on his early record, announcing that he has lost faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves—at least for many years to come. Is he growing wiser?

The more common form of assault on popular government is that against the legislative department; and I believe Americans generally consider this the weakest point. We certainly have developed a legislative disease—a crude passion for making laws; and a cruder idea possesses us that laws are of value even when they outreach the instincts and the education of the people. But I propose in this article to consider the judicial department; and I shall inquire whether it is not the weakest in our history—the least assured friend of popular rights if not of wise government of any sort. Have we over-

estimated the Supreme Court as a factor of our republican system?

Thomas Jefferson, when the first draft of the Constitution was reported to him at Paris, expressed the conviction that the structure of the judicial department involved a vital error. In 1822 he wrote:

"We already see the power, installed for life, responsible to no authority (for impeachment is not even a scarecrow), advancing with noiseless and steady pace to the great object of consolidation. The foundations are already deeply laid, by their decisions, for the annihilation of constitutional State rights and the removal of every check, every counterpoise to the ingulfing power of which themselves are to make a sovereign part. If ever this vast country is brought under a single government, it will be one of the most extensive corruption; indifferent, and incapable of a wholesome care over so wide a spread of surface. This will not be borne; and you will have to choose between reformation and revolution. If I know the spirit of this country, the one or the other is inevitable. Before the canker has become inveterate, before its venom has reached so much of the body politic as to get beyond control, a remedy should be applied. Let the future appointment of judges be for six years, and renewable by the President and Senate. We have erred by copying England, where certainly it is a good thing to have the judges independent of the king. But we have omitted to copy their caution also, which makes a judge removable on the address of both legislative houses. That there should be public functionaries independent of the nation, whatever may be their demerits, is a solecism in a republic, of the first order of absurdity and inconsistency."

It must be borne in mind that this was the latest and ripened conviction of Jefferson, contained in a letter written only a short time before his death. Through the whole of his life, this greatest of our statesmen insisted that our judges should be elected during good behavior. His prompt forecast of danger was speedily confirmed by events. In the first struggle of the American people, beginning immediately with the adopting of the Constitution and lasting to the close of the second war with England—the struggle of factions—the Su-



preme Court took strongly partizan grounds on the side of the Anglicans. Its rulings are allowed by all students of history to have been political rather than judicial. The judges, all of whom were Federals, were not only believers in the right of the few to govern the many, but were accustomed openly to express disbelief in the power of the common people to rule themselves.

The Republican party was organized specifically against the usurpation of this oligarchic sentiment, as expressed both by Congress and the Court. An attempt was made to prevent organic opposition. It became a crime to criticize the government; while the Supreme Court was made use of to crush out the expression of political opposition. The Sedition Act of 1798 made it felonious, and punishable with a fine of two thousand dollars and two years' imprisonment, to publish a scandal against Congress or the President or the Supreme Court. The Alien Act gave the President power to arrest any alien suspect and order him out of the country without trial. If he failed to obey he might be imprisoned three years on the mere order of the President. A citizen of Central New York, for circulating a petition that these outrageous laws be abrogated, was arrested and taken to New York for trial. President Adams, while traveling through New Jersey, was greeted with a salute. An onlooker named Baldwin made use of an insulting expression concerning the President. He was arrested and compelled to pay a fine of a hundred dollars. Ten editors were fined or imprisoned, or both, for criticizing the government. Frothingham was imprisoned for saying that Alexander Hamilton attempted to buy one of the newspapers in order that he might suppress it. Cooper, another editor, was imprisoned four months and fined four hundred dollars for saying that President Adams was "hardly in the infancy of political mistakes." Judge Chase habitually harangued both the accused and the jury, with bluster sometimes bordering on personal assault. In one case he threatened to spank a lawyer whose views were opposed to the governmental party. Mr. Lyon, a Vermonter, while canvassing for reelection, was ar-

rested for charging President Adams with "unbridled thirst for ridiculous pomp and foolish adulation." He paid a fine of one thousand dollars and was confined in jail without a fire in wintry weather for four months. Forty years afterward Congress refunded this fine to his heirs.

In 1800 popular sentiment triumphed over the oligarchic idea and placed Jefferson in the Presidential chair. One of the first acts of the new Administration was to impeach two of the Supreme Court judges, one of whom was removed from office. The Alien and Sedition Acts were voided, and democratic principles secured control of the whole governmental machinery. In 1804 the remnants of the old Federal party, disgusted with the loss of power, formed a league with Burr to elevate him to the governorship of New York. This league was substantially an agreement that Burr should become the head of a confederacy, including New England and New York, with possibly New Jersey. The plot barely failed. The crash involved the killing of Hamilton and the outlawry of Burr; while the chief plotters, such as Pickering, who had been in the Cabinets of both Washington and Adams, Governor Strong of Connecticut, and Justice Parsons of the Supreme Court, survived to plot again in 1814. But the crisis passed, and the Republic was saved from its first period of peril. Through all this era the executive office had been in safe hands, but the legislative department had been dangerously near usurpation; while the judiciary had totally failed to rectify error or arbitrate for safety. It had in fact openly and officiously cast its influence against democratic principles and in favor of aristocracy.

The second period of American history began about 1820—it may be called the struggle of sections. It involved two closely entangled issues—free commerce as opposed to protected industries, and free labor as opposed to slavery. The free-commerce fight culminated in 1832; and, notwithstanding the fact that South Carolina was not permitted to enforce nullification, the battle was won against a sectional use of taxation. The Clay Compromise reduced the tariff to its old

basis; and there it remained practically until 1860 and the civil war. But the free-labor struggle lasted until it was closed by the attempt to form a Southern Confederacy. During the whole of this period the course of our executives, with the exception of Polk, who involved us in an unnecessary war with Mexico, was at least loyal. There were some arrogant hands at the helm, but no traitors. Congress conducted issues in a manner such as might have been expected of any popular body of delegates. In 1847 a bill was before Congress embodying a reference to the Supreme Court of the question of the admission of slavery into the Territories of Oregon, New Mexico, and California. The Court was understood to be strongly biased in favor of the pro-slavery side. As a counter-balance the Senate reported and passed a bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. All the Southern Senators left their seats in the Senate chamber and proceeded to form a new organization elsewhere. They drafted a passionate appeal to their constituents; and there seemed for a time to be an absolute breach of the Union. Such furious heats, however, ended in compromise—until the final revolt of 1861.

But where was the Supreme Court during this struggle? Did it side with free labor or with slave labor? Throughout the whole period, from first to last, the Court was known to be sectional in its sympathies and equally sure to be sectional in its decisions. The Taney-Dred Scott opinion left our legal status in this form: "That the Fugitive Slave law must be enforced in every Northern State, without allowing trial by jury. . . . In no trial or hearing, under this Act, shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence." Marshals were selected, frequently of the baser sort of men, charged with the duty of arresting fugitives and empowered to demand aid of any and all bystanders. In other words, the Supreme Court negated the Declaration of Independence, deciding that a man with a dark skin could have no citizen rights.

It was not, however, this sectionalism of the Supreme Court alone that proved its dangerous possibilities. Having stirred

the North to an unwilling spirit of revolt, and having encouraged the South to engage in positive rebellion, it undertook to prevent the use of Constitutional measures for the sustenance of the Union. It not only gave its decisions for the South and slavery, but it undertook to tie the hands of free labor and the North. Lincoln was compelled to defy it; and he did temporarily set its decisions aside. The people more than indorsed his course. In his first inaugural, Lincoln said:

"I do not forget the position assumed by some—that Constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court. Nor do I deny that such questions must be binding upon the parties to that suit; while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration, in all parallel cases, by all departments of the government. But if the policy of the government upon a vital question, affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court, the moment they are made the people will have ceased to be their own masters, having to that extent resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

The Constitution was made a barrier to the success of the Union army. The conflict culminated under Lincoln's successor, when Congress deliberately forbade the President to fill the vacant seats of the Supreme Court until legislative permission had been granted.

The third era of our history, a struggle of great principles not yet ended, came to the front before the sectional era was entirely closed. It was during the civil war that capital began to secure its mighty grip upon production and distribution. I quote from Judge Thomas M. Cooley, whose cool judgment has won universal regard. He says:

"The government was giving out enormous contracts, in which the profit might be large; and the birds of ill omen gathered about the departments in great flocks, as eager for their feasts and as reckless of anything else as the vultures upon the fields of battle. The government was all the while drawing and paying out large sums of money; and the financial currents were to and from Washington, not to and from the State capitals. Many new offices were now necessarily created; and for the time being the national government was

the great dispenser of favors, privileges, valuable employments, and profitable contracts; whose Executive, by a dash of the pen, was giving offices that gratified the ambition of a lifetime; while heads of departments, by their favors, were enabling others to lay the foundations of enormous fortunes."

The astounding progress made in the concentration of wealth, dating from 1860, cannot be anything but alarming to unbiased students of economics and sociology. The facts that four millionaires in 1860 had increased to over four thousand in 1890, and that tramps, at the former period an unknown social factor, had become in 1890 about half a million, are sufficiently startling. The lowest estimate gives us 336,250 tramps now actually in the field. Mr. Shearman, in the *Forum*, shows that "25,000 persons now possess more than half the national wealth, both real and personal." In the *Political Science Quarterly*, Mr. Holmes states, as the careful result of his studies, that "ninety-one per cent. of 12,690,000 families own twenty-nine per cent. of the wealth; while nine per cent. own seventy-one per cent. of all the wealth of the United States." It needs wilful blindness to prevent any one from seeing that there is a fundamental difficulty in the social adjustment that controls production and distribution. Mr. Waterson, of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, himself a conservative, says: "In the concentration of wealth and in the ostentatious display of wealth, in the gradual cultivation of caste, let the wealthy behold a danger it will be well to consider in the light of both ancient and modern history. With all this unbalancing of distribution, there has gone on a demoralization of public sentiment very akin to that of older States, which has made it impossible for the richer classes to comprehend the claims of the common people and the rights of labor."

But what we are particularly concerned with here is the position of the Supreme Court during this era, which is grinding on, like the mills of the gods, and threatening to grind very fine. We cannot deny that the judicial department of our government has not only been on the side of wealth and aristocracy, but that its decisions on important financial questions

were of so uncertain a sort that we may say it was at the very bottom of our protracted reign of financial suspicion and lack of business confidence. Its decision in the greenback issue gave to Congress power to create money of whatever it chose and make it legal tender. Not to enter into the currency question, it is impossible for any careful student of popular institutions and of government to look without alarm on the loose and unlimited stretch of power thus bestowed by the Court on Congress. Says an acute critic, David McG. Means:

"Of all the checks upon misgovernment the Supreme Court has been regarded as the strongest and surest; and it is still spoken of as the palladium of our liberties. But from the evil day of the first legal-tender decision, thoughtful men have seen that its foundations had been undermined. The constitution and membership of the board were altered by Congress and the President, if not with the deliberate purpose at least with the foreseen result of procuring a reversal of judgment on perhaps the greatest constitutional question that ever came up for decision. It is hardly speaking too strongly to say that this proceeding changed the nature of our government."

But if there be possible two opinions on this question and the effect of this decision of the Supreme Court, there must be close unity concerning the course of the same body on the question of taxation. The income tax, decided to be constitutional, as it undoubtedly was, within six months of that decision—during a brief sitting of the Court, and after a notification of barely thirteen days—was declared to be unconstitutional. We may rest satisfied with the severity of the criticisms of several of the Justices themselves. Justice Harlan said: "It strikes at the very fountain of national authority. It may provoke a contest with the American people that would have been spared if the Court had not overthrown its former decision. Congress cannot tax incomes—while it may compel the workingman to contribute directly from his earnings for the support of the government!" Justice Brown said: "I cannot escape the conviction that the decision is fraught with immeasurable danger to the future of the country and approaches a national calamity." Justice White, more vigor-



ously still, said that "if such a system were followed the red specter of revolution would shake our institutions to their foundations." Congress has rarely ventured on legislation more hasty, and never on legislation so revolutionary as this work of the Supreme Court. At a stroke the Court destroyed three millions of income of the government, and that portion of the income of which John Sherman said "it is the most righteous that I have ever collected."

With this history of the Supreme Court succinctly stated, and without prejudice, it is not to be wondered at if the inferior courts have at times assumed executive and legislative functions; nor is it surprising that we should be charged with treasonable behavior if we dare to criticize their actions. Judge Cowing, in a Brooklyn court, in 1886, while charging the grand jury, said: "He who assails the judiciary becomes a disturber of the public peace and order, and is an enemy of government. Such a man should be regarded as a pirate. Woe betide him, or her, or them, who undertake to attack the judiciary!" The *New York Tribune* justly commented that this doctrine was a relic of the theory of divine right, which, all over the world, puffed up men clothed with authority to regard themselves as wiser and better than their fellows: "A judge is a man like other men. He is selected by the people, from among the people, to discharge certain duties. He is entitled to personal respect, and a chance to do his duty fearlessly, and have the orders of his court obeyed. But he is a good citizen who scrutinizes the motives and official actions of the best judge on the American bench; and he is not a pirate." More recently a judge of a Wisconsin court, who was a candidate for reelection, was criticized severely by a local paper for some of his actions on the bench. The judge had the editor of the paper brought up for contempt, adjudged him guilty, and sentenced him to thirty days' imprisonment. In California, Judge A. P. Catlin, having been unpleasantly criticized by the *Bee*, cited the editor of that paper for contempt, refused him the right to bring evidence that the judge was in the wrong, and then fined him five hundred dollars for

contempt of court. With such sentiments expressed and occasionally put into practise, the people are warranted in believing them indulged by others. Is it any wonder that there has been a growing conviction that American history is likely to repeat antecedent English history? Charles Sumner, referring to the decision of the Supreme Court during the slavery struggle, said: "Let me say that I hold judges, and especially the Supreme Court of the country, in much respect. But I am too familiar with the history of judicial proceedings to regard them with any superstitious reverence. Alas! alas! the worst crimes of history have been perpetrated under their sanction."

But the strangest feature of our national life, as we enter upon the twentieth century, is that the people generally believe that there is a certain criminality in criticizing the judiciary, which does not adhere to a criticism of the executive and legislative departments of government. A popular impression connects with the word "Supreme" the idea that this department is over the others; that it is the arbiter of all legislative and executive action, and that its voice is final and conclusive. This would indeed be a strange government were it true that the people have aborted the function of governing and absolutely delegated supremacy to a court. That the Court has assumed such supremacy we have seen. In 1837 President Van Buren complained of "the encroachments of the Supreme Court," and believed that "it would not have been created had its tendencies been foreseen." Professor Burgess pronounces our government as, on the whole, best defined as an "aristocracy of the robe." The eleventh amendment to the Constitution was intended as a check on the assumptions of the Court. In 1800, as we have seen, the Court was arraigned for treasonable assumption of power. When Judge Marshall had decided contrary to the convictions of President Jackson, the latter said: "John Marshall has made the decision; let him execute it." In 1832, when Jackson determined to withdraw the public funds from national banks, his Secretary of the Treasury refused to obey. Roger B.

Taney was selected to fill the place and execute orders, and later was made Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Jackson defied both Congress and the Court. His course was explainable, if not excusable, from the fact that the Court had committed itself in favor of the National Bank—under implied powers in the Constitution. The majority of the people agreed with the President that the creation of a huge financial corporation, with functions belonging properly to the government itself and out of governmental control, would be fatal to the Republic. The Bank and the Supreme Court were in an alliance on one side; on the other were Jackson and enough members of Congress to make his veto stand. If the President assumed power transcendent to his privilege, it seemed more tolerable to the people than the establishment of a moneyed autocracy that could never be got rid of. In 1855, in Wisconsin, a conflict arose under the Fugitive Slave law. The State court declared that the decision of Chief Justice Taney (in the Dred Scott case) was bad law and should not be enforced inside that State. The controversy was sharp but decisive. The State triumphed, and the decision of the United States Supreme Court was nullified. In Ohio the supreme court of the State found that no law of Congress can compel a State officer to deliver up an alleged criminal to the State of Kentucky. The Supreme Court of the United States pathetically urged its opinions, but it was compelled to confess that it could not enforce them. These have not been the only cases in which the people have resumed power to reverse decisions of the Supreme Court.

It is desirable that the American people should escape from an unreasoning adulation of any single branch of the government. It is especially desirable that we outgrow a conception of the judiciary as immaculate, and of the Supreme Court as a miraculous invention, superior to anything that the world has ever yet seen, or ever can see, in the way of administering law. From a recent volume I take this not unusual estimate of the Court:

"The establishment of the Supreme Court of the United

States was the crowning marvel of the wonders wrought by the statesmanship of America. In truth, the creation of the Supreme Court, with its appellate powers, was the greatest conception of the Constitution. No product of government, either here or elsewhere, has ever approached it in grandeur. In dignity and moral influence it outranks all other judicial tribunals of the world. No institution of purely human contrivance presents so many features calculated to inspire both veneration and awe. The majestic proportions to which the structure was carried become sublime."

This spirit of adulation, bordering on worship, is politically unwholesome, and liable to lead to a revulsion of public sentiment. English critics have been hardly more judicious in their estimate. Mr. Bryce calls the Supreme Court "the living voice of the Constitution." Lord Brougham said: "The power of the Judiciary to prevent either the State legislatures or Congress from overstepping the limits of the Constitution is the very greatest refinement in social policy to which any state of circumstances has given rise, or to which any age has ever given birth." It is true enough that, if the legislative department should at any time overstep its limits of power, the judicial department would be a constitutional check, provided the judicial department were not of the same mind and will as the legislative. But it must be borne in mind that the Justices are always, and without exception, selected by the President out of his own party at least, if not out of his own section or personal clique. It is not surprising that in some cases the Executive has gone so far as to pack the Court for specific measures. The power of party to control any or all Departments was not foreseen by the men who devised the Constitution and its checks. Daniel Webster eloquently said: "I am deeply sensible, and, as I think, every man must be, whose eyes have been opened to what has passed around him for the last twenty years—that the Judicial department is the protecting power of the government." Had Webster lived ten years longer, he would have agreed with both the Executive and the Legislative departments in the suspension of the free action of the

Judicial. Had Taney decided on the basis of both humanity and the common law, there would have been no civil war.

It has been the object of this article to aid somewhat in a just view of that one department of government whose action underlies to the greatest degree the prosperity and advance, or the adversity and disaster, of the nation. The consolidation that Jefferson foresaw is already well under way. The Supreme Court is so burdened with the assumption of business that properly belongs to State courts that its own appropriate business is hopelessly in arrears. It spends its time discussing the unlawful cutting of timber and the passing of counterfeit money, while on the other hand a case under the tariff or revenue laws cannot be reached. It is an effort to decrease State dignity and integrity to the increase of consolidated power. The cases piled up, and already practically out of reach, are over seven hundred. What we call our Judicial Department is five years behind date in its important business. It is this state of affairs that has created the habit of speaking of our Constitution as "outgrown." Mr. Woodrow Wilson lately shows how the balances enumerated by John Adams have failed; and he implies that the new nationalism has permanently obliterated the old power and right of the States. President Andrews, in his "History of the United States," does not hesitate to affirm that, "while men still differ as to the original nature of the Union, yet the civil war laid the question of national supremacy over States forever at rest—having therefore virtually the effect of a constitutional amendment. Practically the war entailed enormous new exaltation and centralization of the Union, with answering degradation of the States." The problem, then, is upon us: Has a revolution been accomplished politically, and another financially, by the Judicial Department of our government, while the people have been under the effect of an opiate in the way of adulation?

E. P. POWELL.

*Clinton, N. Y.*

## CIVILIZATION AND THE SOCIAL COMPACT.

NOTWITHSTANDING the frequency with which the word *civilization* is used, it is doubtful whether a more ambiguous term is to be found in our language. Even among the most scholarly citizens there is no agreement as to what the word means. A widespread belief obtains both among educated and uneducated people that every civilization is liable to decay; that it has a limited life like an individual, and when a certain height is reached in wealth, literature, art, and the sciences, it begins to falter in its progress, then enter its dotage, and finally succumb to dissolution. This notion being largely the teaching of history, every student and every patriotic citizen naturally asks himself these questions: What reason have we for presuming that our own civilization will not perish as all the rest have done? What element is there in modern civilization that was not present in that of the past?

According to Guizot, there are two factors that distinguish modern civilization. One is individual development and the other is social order. In a general way this statement is true. But men differ much as to what individual development means. If it simply means the expansion of the intellect, one may easily imagine a nation of people having very high mental development together with a very low state of morals. Or if individual development is to include moral development or virtue, it is easy to conceive of a nation having a larger number of enlightened and virtuous people and at the same time having a still wider stratum of population that is both ignorant and vicious. Furthermore, moral perfection and virtue are terms, like civilization, about which people do not agree respecting their precise meaning. Political platforms forcibly illustrate the conflict of opinions respecting what is moral and immoral. Hence, the fact of individual development is too ambiguous to set up as a distinction between modern and ancient civilization. What modern men are superior to Plato, Demosthenes,



Aristotle, Homer, or Cicero? Or in moral development where is the superior to Marcus Aurelius or Socrates?

Guizot's second factor, social order, is alike ambiguous. Of course, if the individuals of a country are intellectually and morally developed the social condition of the people as a whole is bound sooner or later to improve also. But just as men differ as to what individual development means, so do they differ as to what is meant by social progress or order. For instance, M. Guizot, arguing upon his two propositions, contends that France is the most civilized nation in the world: first, because it has the largest number of highly developed individuals, and second, because it has the best social order, or the most equitable distribution of the blessings of life. The authorities upon history and the common sense of mankind by no means agree with this opinion. Mr. Benjamin Kidd takes exactly the opposite view, maintaining that France is far behind in moral development and that it has less of the elements of stability than any of our so-called civilizations.

Civilization has been defined in many curious ways, according to the different standpoints from which viewed. Some writers inform us that gunpowder and the printing-press are its chief factors, and that they alone secure us against relapsing into a state of barbarism. It would be humiliating to have to confess that our civilization rested only upon physical force. There never was a greater mistake than the notion some people have that society is held together by armies, navies, police, sheriffs, jails, and chain-gangs. God pity us, if these are our safeguards! Powder and dynamite may be used by anarchists as well as by men in blue coats and brass buttons. As to the printing-press—that, like powder, is a great power; but whether its influence is for good or evil depends altogether upon the moral state of society. In 1898 twenty thousand books were published in the English language. If the quantity of literature has anything to do with civilization, we are certainly ahead of any other age. But, whether these books are good or bad, or whether the people read the good or bad ones, depends upon something deeper and more profound than the existence of printing-presses and deadly explosives.

A great many people associate the idea of civilization with wealth. If a nation has large trade, immense capital, rich and luxurious citizens, they say that makes civilization. If that is the correct measure, the United States certainly stands at the top notch of civilizations; for we have a total capital of about sixty-five billion dollars, which is one thousand for each person, including women and children. Our inventions and discoveries for making wealth are beyond computation. The motive forces employed in turning the wheels of our mills are perhaps equal to five million horse-power, which is the equivalent of about one horse-power to every fourteen persons. Our railroads have almost abolished distance. If placed end to end they would encircle the earth eight or ten times. We have tamed electricity and made it light our streets and propel our cars. We have made it carry the human voice over the mountains and under the waters and from city to city with the breath of lightning. We have made it fold up the human voice so that it may be laid away and reproduced after we are dead. With our telescopes we have taken an inventory of the heavens and peeped into the crevices of the moon, sun, and stars. With our machinery we have produced fabulous quantities of food, clothing, furniture, and all sorts of ornaments and trinkets.

In the older civilizations there were not so many influences that tended to expand the human heart. Such patriotism as existed had its origin in a brutish desire to live by preying upon the weak and defenseless. The kind of cohesion that held society together was not sympathy, but rather that self-interest which unites thieves and highwaymen. The depredations of the people, or their "military exploits," as historians call them, gave a certain unity to national life and stimulated intellectual activity, which are the usual accompaniments of victories in war. Upon this narrow and feeble bond of union rested all the old civilizations. But while brute force is sometimes sufficient to plant a civilization, only enlightened sympathy can bind it together and preserve it.

A large proportion of the people among the ancient nations

(and most often a majority of them) were not allowed to own land or houses. Merchandizing and all sorts of manual labor were regarded as degrading. Cicero said that no noble sentiment could come from a workshop. Slaves, as a rule, were not allowed to marry because it was cheaper to steal them from abroad than to rear them. The great commonalty, having no home or families to defend, could not become very patriotic, and of course felt little interest in the fate of civilization. Even among the upper classes the home was far different from that which exists in our own time and country. In Greece marriages were generally arranged by the parents, the couple often not seeing each other before the ceremony. Liberty of choice was the exception. The father had the arbitrary right to recognize or reject his child at its birth, to repudiate his wife, or to exclude his son from the family worship. In course of time the family tie became more loosely drawn and still more easily broken. Aged husbands were required, at one time, to cede their wives to younger men. Even so great a man as Plato advocated common possession of women.

With such base conceptions of the family it is not surprising that parental affection was weak. In many instances children were left to the mercy of slaves; they were poorly fed and ill clad. They went barefooted all the year and slept upon beds of dried leaves. In Sparta they were taught to steal in order to sharpen their wits, and to run races in a state of nakedness for the amusement of the depraved populace. Their sharpened wits enabled them in after years to cheat their aged parents out of their estates by a corrupt connivance with the courts. The family life in Rome was scarcely an improvement upon the Greek; indeed, in some respects it was far less stable. Seneca regarded the affections as something that each individual should aim to suppress. Divorces multiplied with dazing rapidity. It was not uncommon to find a man or woman who had been married eight or ten times. Gibbon says that "a passion, interest, or caprice suggested daily motives for dissolution of marriage; a word, a message, a letter, the mandate of a freeman, declared the separation." Children were exposed to

wild beasts, and aged parents were often killed or allowed to die of neglect.

Even the religion of the ancients had little tendency toward expanding the people's sympathies. In Greece the religion was distinctly a family affair. One family could not worship with another, nor one individual with another, unless they belonged to the same household. There was no universal faith, no common God or common idea sympathetically embracing all men and classes. "Each god," says De Coulanges, "protected one family and was god in only one house. . . . Two families live side by side, but they have different gods. The woman upon marrying must give up the god of her infancy, and put herself under the protection of a god whom she knows not." The religion did not teach a man that his neighbor was his brother. To quote again the same author: "It is said to him, That is a stranger; he cannot participate in the religious acts of thy hearth; he cannot approach the tomb of thy family; he has other gods than thine, and cannot unite with thee in common prayer; thy gods reject his adoration and regard him as thine enemy; he is thy foe also." In Rome there was no common belief or sympathy concerning anything. The sailors worshiped Neptune, the traders Mercury, the farmers Ceres, and the drunkards Bacchus. Every man had a god to suit his own notion.

Is it any wonder that the old civilizations fell to pieces—victims of moral canker within and enemies without? Poets now write in lamenting strains over the ruins of the past. Scholars and historians pause among the broken columns and fragments of art to pay homage to the brilliant achievements of a once great people. But they look in vain for evidence of the existence of a hospital for the sick, a refuge for the blind, the insane, the orphaned, or a home for the poor and decrepit.

After a long night of dissolution and despair, a new light began to brighten the pathway of the human race. That light was Christianity. It contained one idea that engaged the sympathy of a wider circle of men than any other idea that was ever before presented to the conception of man. That idea was

universal equality before God and a common hope of eternal life. The new doctrine taught that the manual laborer and the lordly master were equal in the sight of God. It taught the great to be humble servants of the poor, and it taught the poor that they might be the equals of the great. Says Blanqui: "It raised the slaves without lowering the master, and presented to the human race, bowed under the yoke, a refuge from the tyranny of this world in the hopes of the other." The rich and the poor, the master and the slave, had for the first time a common interest and a common hope. They worshiped the same God, yielded submission to the same religious laws and precepts, and knelt and communed at the same altar. The poor never before felt so uplifting a power. "The Christian priest," quoting again Blanqui, "awaited at the baptismal font the newly-born babe and bestowed upon him a name; later he blessed him in marriage; and finally, when the end of life had come, he accompanied him with prayers to the tomb." The poor were succored, the sick ministered to, the prisons visited, and Heaven itself seemed to descend to earth in the birth of charity and philanthropy. "All humanity was invited to the banquet of life." Christianity met the barbarian on the frontier, tamed his passions, and changed a society based upon force and slavery to one based upon freedom. At the same time it effected the reestablishment of the family institution and made it the foundation-stone of modern civilization.

For several centuries after its birth, Christianity was almost the only common interest that held society together. But out of this one a second common interest soon grew up. As the homes and the lives of the people became more secure, their industrial and intellectual activities naturally began to quicken; and as production and capital multiplied, the desire became more urgent for national peace and order. Hence, a new principle entered into society to aid in giving it stability—a principle that Guizot calls the principle of order. Monarchies began to spring up all over Europe. Up to the twelfth century there were in the main only two binding elements in society, one religious and the other political. As civilization advanced

these threads of common interest began to multiply and interlace the social fabric.

The point of superiority of modern over ancient civilization consists in the greater expansion of our sympathies as shown in the many interests and organizations that link us together. People at the present time have common interests in more different things, and are willing to unite along more different lines of activity than was the case in any previous epoch of the world's history. People are not only bound together by political and religious ties, but by such ties as belong to the Masons, Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, temperance societies, the Farmers' Alliance, the Knights of Labor, associations of doctors, lawyers, dentists, and educators, and such ties as belong to literary clubs, art leagues, academies of science, social circles, chess clubs, baseball clubs, and bicycle clubs. Besides these organized interests there are many that are unorganized. For instance, in literature, art, philosophy, politics, and religion there are a great number of lights or leaders who stand for a certain set of ideas and principles. Each has a large following of individuals whose sympathies reach out to one another from the "four corners of the earth." Modern civilization is more stable than the ancient, because our sympathies are wider and more interwoven. We are more dependent on one another, and hence have a greater interest in social order.

The sympathetic ties, I repeat, arise from and depend upon the family. A larger percentage of the people now own homes, and the home life of the people is more stable, than ever before. Hence, the attachment of persons for the natural objects associated with home is also stronger now than at any former period. This is not only due to the fact that people are more fixed in their abodes, but is due in a larger measure to the art of photography and the improvements in transportation. Traveling is so cheap that the circle of our acquaintance reaches out to wide limits and at the same time we become familiar with many different localities. Cheap pictorials enable us to look into the faces of many people whom



we cannot know personally, and to become acquainted with the natural scenery and great works of art in every section of the country. In this way our idea of home is enlarged, and we begin to realize the truth that we are all members of one family and belong to one household.

Civilization depends on the *use* that is made of wealth, not on the quantity of it. "Twenty people can gain money," says Ruskin, "for one who can use it; and the vital question for every individual and for every nation is, never how much do they make, but to what purpose do they spend." It is impossible to conclude of any given mass of acquired wealth, merely by the fact of its existence, whether it signifies good or evil to the nation in the midst of which it exists. Its real value depends upon the moral sign attached to it, just as sternly as that of a mathematical quantity depends upon the algebraical sign attached to it. Any given accumulation of wealth may be indicative, on the one hand, of faithful industries, progressive energies, and productive ingenuities; or, on the other, it may be indicative of mortal luxuries, merciless tyranny, and ruinous chicane. Some treasures are heavy with human tears, as an "ill-stored harvest with untimely rain," and we may add that much of our wealth of to-day is obtained at a fearful sacrifice of life. More men, women, and children are annually put to death by our mechanical appliances and by exposure to poisonous atmospheres than were ever killed in the most deadly of modern wars. Large dividends are coined out of the flesh and blood of helpless women and children. Immense fortunes are often gleaned at the expense of shattered constitutions, broken courage, and blighted hopes. Opulence and luxury often have a history that goes back to tenement-houses, whose very architecture invites disease, despondency, and crime. Those who are well provided for and reap only the fruits of human efforts little realize the cruel and crushing processes by which wealth is accumulated, "reckoning not that commerce floats its wares upon deep seas of human suffering."

Our wealth is abundant, and if more wisely used would

suffice to supply the essentials of civilized life for all our people. It is in our power, by the proper use of wealth, to eliminate most of the hardships of the poor; to give them more leisure, better education, better homes, more congenial and more elevating environments, and longer life. Let the rich and idle brains and arms do more work and squander less wealth, and let the weary arms and brains have more rest and more of the comforts of civilization! We make people what they are largely by our institutions and the use we put our money to. Let us inaugurate better institutions and employ our wealth in a way that will make people what they ought to be! Let us hope that the problem of the new century will not be how much wealth we can pile up, but how much good we can do with what we have! The wider we can send out our sympathies—the stronger the social compact—the freer society will be from corroding and disrupting influences, and the more pleasurable will be the sensations of life to each individual. Great industrial and intellectual achievements do not avail for civilization unless there is a corresponding development of character, which insures the use of the achievements to the end that the human race may be uplifted, cheered, and blessed.

JEROME DOWD.

*Trinity College, Durham, N. C.*

## THE UNIVERSITY AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

THE letter of George D. Herron resigning the professorship of Applied Christianity in Iowa College has been published, together with the reply of the Board of Trustees. This resignation and the letter setting forth the reasons therefor bring once more to public attention the question of freedom of thought and teachings as to wealth and social systems, also the broader problems connected with the discovery of social laws and the dissemination of such knowledge. As social progress is dependent upon the effectiveness of the machinery or system whereby social laws are discovered and the knowledge disseminated, it follows that there is no question that is more important to society.

Professor Herron's attitude is unusually manly in many ways. He voluntarily resigns an assured income—for the endowment would have followed him from the College had he not insisted otherwise—and he goes forth into the world with a family and only such an income as he can earn as a social missionary. Furthermore, he has changed his opinion during the last year and does not hesitate to stand by his present convictions. From believing it to be his duty to insist on academic freedom, he not only argues against this freedom, at least in our private universities and colleges, but his argument may be construed to mean that "the other side" may rightfully be kept from the student. He says: "I shall defend the constituency and trustees of Iowa College in their right to choose what they shall have taught." In another place he says: "I question any man's right to teach that which the College constituency do not want." And again: "But educational institutions as now organized and supported, dependent as they are on gifts of money from the existing social order, afford no place for the teaching of disturbing social ideals." And he also says: "You are not the owners of the College, but trustees holding it in trust for the constituency to whom you are responsible." But it is quite probable that, when the

Professor wrote these reasons for his resignation, he had in mind the one question as to the right of a board of trustees to retain only those employees whose views on economic and other social questions should coincide with its own.

Professor Herron's surrender of all claims to the right of academic freedom on the part of professors in our endowed institutions, at least, marks an important epoch, for it is, I believe, the position taken by most of those who are studying the situation. But in this letter there is no pointing to, and doubtless it was not the place to mention, the correlative duty resting upon the board of trustees that employs as teachers of the facts and principles involved in class questions only those men and women who champion its views.

Before taking up this duty I desire briefly to set forth the opinions of quite a number of trustees of the leading universities in this country. During the summer of 1897 there was before the country the case of President Andrews at Brown University. At this time a trustee of the Northwestern University, Mr. James H. Raymond, a lawyer in Chicago, who for years had been actively engaged in the management of the University, published in the *Chicago Tribune* of September 3d an article in which he presents his views as to the proper form of government for our universities, including the departments that pertain to questions concerning wealth and government. The system contended for is as follows:

The law should clothe the board of trustees with power to employ and discharge the professors, as is now the case. "As to what should be taught in political science and social science, they [the professors] should promptly and gracefully submit to the determination of the trustees when the latter find it necessary to act. . . . A professor is not a mere parrot, to repeat and fairly explain to his students the diametrically opposing premises, arguments, and conclusions of the writers and teachers of the ages upon any given subject. He must of necessity be an advocate; but his advocacy must be in harmony with the powers that be, with the animus and main purposes of the institution, and with the teachings of his co-laborers." In the system advocated by Trustee

Raymond, Progress is to be secured in this way: "The limitations in the [teachings in the] social and political sciences must be the consistent policy and action of the powers that be, who, if loyally supported, may be safely trusted to keep up with the real progress of the times and not to establish barriers to all reasonable thought and action. If the trustees err it is for the patrons and proprietors, not for the employees, to change either the policy or the personnel of the board."

The above is said so plainly that there are no two ways of construing it. It upholds the law as it at present exists in each State. Each board of trustees is given the power to employ and dismiss professors, and in only two or three instances in this country has the board of a State university delegated to its professors of the science of wealth and government the right to teach that which is thought to be the truth regardless of the boards of trustees, and also to retain their positions and salaries. Professor Herron agrees that each professor should either teach the policies that the board desires to have taught or resign his position—and such, I believe, is the growing opinion among university professors themselves; but, they argue, the recognition of this principle carries with it a far-reaching reciprocal duty, which I shall point out a little later.

Immediately after Mr. Raymond's article appeared I went out to Evanston, the site of the university, and interviewed such members of the executive committee of the board of trustees as I could find and who would talk for publication. A majority of those who read Mr. Raymond's article or were told its points agreed with him. I then called upon Mr. Raymond, who said that not only in Rhode Island (Brown University) was there a demand on the part of the professors of economic, political, and social science freely to teach what they conceived to be right, but also in Massachusetts, in New York in two institutions, in Ohio, in Indiana, and in three institutions in Illinois. It was these cases that led Mr. Raymond publicly to discuss the principles that should apply. In defense of those principles Mr. Raymond carefully dictated for publication the following statement: "During the week that has elapsed since the publication of

my article I have not received any criticism from university circles, but have received from most unexpected sources the most unqualified commendation of them [nine propositions, including the above]. The commendations that I refer to come not only from officers of our university but also from those connected with other institutions who have given this matter long and careful study."

The next day I called at the University of Chicago and presented Mr. Raymond's article to the secretary and to two trustees, each of whom agreed heartily and unequivocally with Mr. Raymond's views. Later I interviewed trustees of the following universities: Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Pennsylvania, and the American (Washington). Of the trustees that I have interviewed the opinions agreed with Mr. Raymond's almost unanimously. A few would not express any view for publication, showing that they did not desire to have the public know where they stood. The secretary of a noted institution nodded his head approvingly while reading and then refused to make a statement for publication. Newspaper reporters secured interviews for me with trustees of the Vanderbilt and Syracuse universities, and they agreed with Mr. Raymond. Further proof is the character of the teachings of the professors who are continued in employment.

A highly important point made by Mr. Raymond when I interviewed him was that the form of university government that he advocated was suited, in his opinion, to *this* country. As the special peculiarity of this country over Germany, for example, is the rule of the majority—"ye multitude"—the statement is highly significant. It is in line with the reason assigned by a prominent professor as to why some of the truths concerning wealth and government were not to be freely told. Dr. Francis A. Walker, while professor of economics at Yale (1878), wrote:

"Especially with regard to the effects of contraction [falling prices] have economic writers been greatly influenced by the attitude in which they have come to regard themselves as preachers instead of teachers—as in some degree respon-



sible for the conduct of affairs, rather than as simply bound to investigate economic phenomena fearlessly and impartially. Having satisfied themselves that there is great political danger from the instincts of repudiation and confiscation, they seem to feel it their public duty to divulge nothing that, either by being understood or by being misunderstood, could minister to those instincts. This is not the only department of political economy in which much has been written in the same spirit as if the chemist should refuse to disclose the secrets of poisonous agencies lest men should take advantage of them to perpetrate crimes."

The foregoing shows the actual conditions that prevail in private universities in the United States. Against this system our professors have protested. While the Andrews case at Brown University was under consideration about three years ago, the faculty of that institution addressed an open letter to the board of trustees, in which it is said:

"First, is it a good thing for the community that the public statement of unpopular opinions, or opinions judged erroneous, should be restrained? The answer to the question rests to-day where Milton rested it in the 'Areopagitica': 'And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple: who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?' To this confident belief of magnanimous minds, that truth is confidently safe, add the experience of mankind. That experience has shown that no man or body of men is wise enough to pick out the doctrines that had better be suppressed, and that the attempt to suppress doctrines only gives them increase of strength. Numberless instances have given practical demonstration to the principle that Milton proclaimed, and have convinced mankind that their real interests require that error, or seeming error, be met with the weapons of discussion and not of repression."

About this time (the summer of 1897) a similar statement favoring academic freedom was signed by professors in different parts of the United States and presented to the board of trustees of Brown University. The statement was very generally signed, thus demonstrating the claim of Mr. Raymond that the professors were insisting on academic freedom.

But there are strong reasons against academic freedom, and I believe they are such as to cause the public to decide against it. The principal reason is that a better system can more readily be secured. Academic freedom on the more important class questions exists in this country only to a very limited extent, and for all practical purposes it may be said that it does not exist at all. This, in itself, should lead us to suspect that there are valid reasons why it does not exist. But the prevailing system is intolerable and must be developed. The probable line of development I shall set forth after stating the reason why academic freedom, even if it could be secured, would still be very inadequate.

Where a question concerning economic, political, or social science is such that experts disagree, it does not seem to be the right thing for a believer in one side to present to students or other novices *both sides* of the case. And it makes no difference whether the expert agrees or disagrees with the board that employs him. It is doubtless better to have academic freedom if one man is to present both sides; but there is great evil in thus presenting it, for a person cannot believe that the opposing views are both true. The alternative that seems to have the greatest merit is this: The board of trustees in each university, continuing as at present to employ and discharge the professors at will, should enact a by-law providing a way whereby "the other side" of each disputed question in economics and government—class questions—may be presented to the students by an expert who believes in the side of the question he champions. A practical way to do this is being employed daily; namely, the Written Debate.

To apply the written debate to the case in hand, let the by-law declare that once a year, say, each professor of economic or political science may be asked by a leading organization representing a view opposed to that of the professor to state in writing the principle that in his opinion exists in the particular field in question, and to cite the facts upon which he relies to demonstrate its existence. Such a statement is practicable, for the material in text-books and articles can be re-

ferred to minutely and supplemented. Two copies of this should be handed to the organization or its representative for answer. The reply should specifically admit or deny each principle, and as to the disputed ones should admit or deny the accuracy of each statement of fact and set forth the proof. This answer, annexed to a copy of the professor's statement, should then be returned to him for reply. In case he brings in new matter it should be returned for answer, and the answer given back for reply. This approximates what is done in the pleadings and trial in a court of justice, and is in effect what is being done at present in the field of science where the questions are not too important. The by-law of the university should provide also for the publication of the written debate and its sale at a reasonable price, and copies should be distributed gratuitously to each of the libraries in the several universities, colleges, and in many of the public reading-rooms.

To make sure that the students study the positions of the opposing sides, each one before receiving his or her degree should pass an examination before a State board composed of representatives of the opposing views. This fact of conflicting class interests is recognized in the board of election commissioners, and should also be recognized in the court of justice wherein class questions are determined. No student will be called upon to express his opinion as to the merits, but will be asked simply to state the claims, of the contending classes as set forth by the leading advocates for each side. To form such a board requires a law in each State, and this law should further declare that the only institutions authorized to confer the degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts, Science, and Philosophy, or Doctor of Philosophy, are those whose by-laws contain the minimum requirements of the system decided upon. This would be constitutional, just as it is to raise the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine or Bachelor of Laws.

In the courts of justice the pleadings used to be oral, but as mankind developed the written pleadings were adopted in order that the points in dispute could be accurately singled out and the evidence examined by those called upon to ascertain the

facts in the case. In these written pleadings the parties are obliged to admit or deny every proposition, and thus are forced squarely to join issue, and then the proof is brought before the jury. In the matter of class questions, which are much more complicated and of infinitely more importance when the progress of mankind is considered, have we not reached the stage where public sentiment will demand that the claims as to facts and principles pertaining to human progress shall be carefully formulated; the opposition be given an opportunity to criticize and disprove; and that then the admissions and opposing evidence be placed before all those who are asking as to God's laws concerning mankind? If the question were as to securing the truthful interpretation of the revelations given to us through the tongue and pen of ancient prophets, there would be a unanimous agreement for the full truth—that no part be falsified; and we have every reason to believe that there is almost as great a unanimity that in this land—a land where the laws should be in accordance with the self-interest of the majority as they are led to see it at the time they cast their ballots—the truth, as we of to-day are able to ascertain it from social phenomena, should be conveyed to those voters. Our system for ascertaining God's laws of social progress must be developed if society is to develop. Man progresses only as he has the intelligence and honesty to provide the machinery whereby he may learn to know God's laws as to social progress. He cannot excuse himself in this self-governing country by declaring that a full knowledge of God's laws should be confined to a few, and therefore that these few should rule the many by falsely educating them as to what God's laws really are. Liberty of speech and of the press are guaranteed in our Constitutions, national and State, and we must extend the principle to the seats of learning. Let us insist that those who claim to see the truth and to demonstrate it from the facts of history, and who secure a considerable following, shall have the liberty to disprove, if they can, the views held by the dominant interests in the State! Let us insist on the erection of an Ideal Social Forum!

GEORGE H. SHIBLEY.

*Bureau of Economic Research, New York City.*

## CRIMINAL SOCIOLOGY:

### THE AMERICAN VS. THE LATIN SCHOOL.

**F**EW subjects possess so deep and vital an interest as that of criminal sociology. This is true because of the growing importance of the criminal classes, and of the serious nature of the problems connected with crime. It is equally true that there is no other subject of which there are such erroneous concepts. While in reality it embraces studies in anthropometry, penology, psychology, sociology, and other subjects, it is popularly believed to include only one small phase—the anthropometric. Few extend the subject to include a study of environments and of so-called normal individuals. Many investigators within the field of criminal sociology do not realize that their investigations may be dignified by that name.

Criminal sociology, as it is being developed in the United States and in some European countries, means not only a study of criminals within prison walls—of their anatomy, craniums, and physiognomy—but includes an investigation of the criminal's haunts, of his habits, amusements, associates. Neither the psychology nor environmental forces are neglected. In environmental forces are included such as the influence of social and sanitary surroundings, climate, food, light, heat, governmental and economic conditions, occupations; also parental influences, training, education, culture, opportunities, desires, habits, etc. The study of the life of the criminal in the community is more essential and yields richer results than the study within prison walls. Besides this knowledge, there must be possessed more adequate information of the so-called normal classes, and the manner of their functioning in response to external stimuli—namely, social forces. The criminal cannot, as has so often been done, be compared with the ideal individual, but with the one whose adjustment to society is better than his own. Criminal soci-

ology includes the study of all these forces; and it is by these that it arrives at a determination of the causes of and remedies for crime. Although the criminal class has characteristics peculiar to it as such, the methods of research must be individual as well as collective. Crude observations of a group of people with no corresponding study of environmental forces, or of the psychology, lead to one-sided results. There must also be the knowledge of the modes and principles of successful adjustment to society, before the variation from it can be studied; otherwise there is no room for comparison.

The methods of study have been variable. They first consisted in theological doctrines and laymen's casual observations, for which no statistical basis was deemed possible. Later these theories were sometimes deductions from reports of institutions, and were often distortions of facts. Theories were promulgated according to the point of view of the theorist, and a presentation of facts without a pet moral attached was not believed possible. It is only since sociology has become a serious study that the theorists have been willing to toil among the facts for a verification or refutation of their theories. Since students have entered upon the practical investigation, two methods (and hence divergent results) have been employed. Emphasizing the anatomical and atavistic side, the Italian investigators, with Lombroso as originator and leader, have confined their observations to the structure of the criminal, and have accurately recorded measurements, anomalies, and defects. Less accurate work has also been done in their study of emotional states. This is the laboratory method and permits of minute, critical, individual examination. The other method is that largely pursued by the French, and is well illustrated by such results as are found in Le Bon's volumes, "Psychology of Crowds" and "Psychology of Peoples." It is the collective method as opposed to the individual.

Both of these methods possess defects. The former neglects the environment and such influences as training and associates; the latter pays too little heed to individual physical defects and inefficiencies. Both neglect physiological psy-



chology and the functioning of the individual by means of his senses in response to stimuli. Differences in physical structure and in social influences have been noted, but the differences in perception, coördinating powers, and keenness of sensibility in receiving impressions and responding to stimuli have been ignored. This is partly true because of the extreme difficulty with which processes have been evolved that have made psychological results trustworthy. The one-sidedness of the study has emphasized the views that crime is a disease, that crime-centers exist in the brain, and that heredity is the great cause of crime. It is difficult to ascertain just what each advocate means by his assertions. Because epilepsy and other diseases prevail in the criminal class, it is concluded that there is an intimate relation between the two, and that the disease precedes the crime. But it must be noted that the diseases of the legally defined criminal class are publicly noted and recorded, while the diseases in other classes frequently evade this. Such statistics, in order to be of value, must show the ratio of the disease to the population and the percentage for the criminal and non-criminal classes.

With regard to insanity the same objection may be stated. Workers in criminal sociology have become too accustomed to accuse heredity of all the results for which no other cause can be found. With the most minute, searching investigation in the biological laboratories, it is difficult in lower forms to establish a principle of heredity; yet with the most meager study of the forces that cause variation, there are attributed to heredity the gravest responsibilities. It is so easy to say a child is "bad" because its parents are such, the training and influence of such parents being disregarded. If the child of respectable parents goes astray, it is attributed to atavism, some remote ancestor being resurrected. The nature of the child and adaptation of the training to the nature are not carefully considered. The conformity of parents to social laws is not necessarily a guarantee of wise parental guidance within the home.

On the other hand, the collective method has included ad-

herents of socialistic and anarchistic tendencies. They have held the social, economic, and political order to blame for all evils, when it has only made laws to protect itself. They ignore the fact that it is not possible to group a large body of men together and have them secure identical perspectives of the best educational policy, best industrial method, best means of attaining personal and community ends. This must be true so long as individual interests precede general ones; so long as the fundamental principle of self-preservation is sharpened by the competitive struggle under the industrial system; so long as there are passions and desires that obscure and are paramount to the allegiance to social welfare. Society's laws are not evolved with reference to individual desires of its members; and a little less perception or more energy than is necessary for the individual's adjustment to these laws may not be society's fault, but is found in a multitude of obscure causes that will not yet bear separate analysis.

Believing that these methods of investigation have not secured the results desired, I have attempted a small beginning in a study that involves a greater number of forces that operate in the criminal's and non-criminal's life. Though no attempt is being made to fit facts to theories, the hypothesis is that the cultural, educational, and moral status, rather than that of criminal and normal, makes the differences that Lombroso and others have asserted exist between the two classes. For my investigation I have selected four classes; namely, students, legally defined criminals, domestics, and negroes. The students have been measured at the universities; the criminals in the workhouses and penitentiaries at Joliet, Cincinnati, and in New York City. From the legally defined criminals, I have used thieves, murderers, and courtesans—classes used by Lombroso. The domestic class is chosen because the greater number of criminals come from this class. The work upon the negroes includes both criminals and normals, and is for the purpose of studying racial and social conditions. I have confined my investigation to women because study in this line has been limited and because the increase in

crime among them demands it. Though in numbers women criminals are inferior, yet her position is such that the influence for evil of one such woman far exceeds that of one criminal man. An instigator to crime is often more threatening to society than the one committing it.

My investigation falls into three groups and under two methods. The groups include anthropometrical, psychological, and sociological. The methods include the individual, which is that used in the first two groups, and the collective, which is used only in the last. The first method consists of measurements and observations; the second of questions, records, visitations to homes, inquiries of associates and officials, and observations upon criminals in groups. My anthropometric measurements consist of twenty-six taken upon the cranium and face, of foot-imprints, and of observations. They were similar to those of Lombroso, and were taken for the purpose of comparison with his results. I have called into question the use of Lombroso's results for the United States, for the following reasons:

(1) His work has been largely confined to structure, and structural peculiarities are often identified with race, and are the result of a multitude of varying forces, as climate, food, soil, geographical location, seasons, districts (urban or rural), etc. Thus his results must apply only to the race upon whom taken and not to the whole criminal class. For the reason that his investigations touch only the structural, and his measurements of normals have been so few, many of his deductions are unsupported.

(2) His facts do not justify his conclusions. The ignoring of social and psychological factors makes the work valuable only from the anatomical side. Furthermore, he is given to generalizations that cannot be accepted. Thus his description of a typical murderer, and attributing to the criminal class such features as heavy jaws, high cheek-bones, and receding foreheads, are too sweeping. Such generalizations cannot hold for a class that often has only crime as a common element. Anglo-Saxons resemble one another, and there is a typical

Anglo-Saxon; but the murderer may be a Spanish nobleman and commit his crime through the most violent passion, or he may be a German peasant, and it may be the result of deliberate planning for mercenary ends. Physically and emotionally, one description would scarcely cover both individuals.

(3) His popular articles, as "Homicide in North America" and "Was Columbus Morally Irresponsible?" have tended to make his readers regard the science for which he has done so much as mere play-work and as lacking in scientific basis and method. It is extremely difficult to deal accurately with facts obtained in the present-day life, to say nothing of using musty records of the fourteenth century, which are at best the opinions of the men who wrote them and newspaper material, as that on homicides, written to meet popular demand and without regard to its scientific value. Many Americans know criminal sociology only through Lombroso and his popular articles, and these are not representative of the serious study of the subject.

The psychological test consists of the following: reaction time to sound, sensibility of the skin, discrimination of high pitch, color preference and discrimination, reading, hearing, fatigue tests, memory, sensibility to pain, taste, smell, association of ideas, precision tests, and emotional reaction, as shown in respiration curves. These were taken in order to secure new data and make the study more complete. The sociological observations included facts about crimes, occupations, parents, children, habits, conjugal condition, social life, nationality, education, etc.

It is the outcome of this threefold investigation, both in method and results, that I wish to present; and while it is not possible to advance conclusions upon so small a number of measurements, yet they point out errors and tend to show results that cannot but prove of suggestive value.

In such a study as this, the difficulties to be overcome are almost insuperable. It is easy to obtain students for subjects, and they cooperate with the investigator; but with the criminal classes this is not true. Only after much effort can admission

to the institutions be secured. Under our political system, where all sorts of methods and trickery are resorted to in order to secure political material, officials must be judicious in admitting investigators unreservedly within institutions. The criminals possess so much suspicion and superstition that it requires much effort to explain and convince them of the nature and innocence of the tests. Their great suspicion grows out of the sharp competitive struggle for existence, and their necessity for protecting themselves from further arrests. Superstition is due often to the narrow, ignorant life they lead. Suspicion causes them to believe that the measurements are to be used for their identification or to their disadvantage, or that they will be hurt during the investigation. Superstition transformed the investigator into a mind-reader, hypnotist, and fortune-teller. This was the highest concept many of them held of the study. Frequently they believed I wished to learn if they were insane; and as they have a great fear of insanity, many would not come. Combined with the fear of the study was curiosity, and this often won the day and brought them into the laboratory.

For the presentation of the results of the investigation, I have used the same divisions as in the laboratory—*anatomical, psychological, sociological*. As sociological investigation is best known, data regarding occupation, habits, education, their letters and wishes, conjugal condition, parents, children, etc., are first presented. In this way the close relation to psychology may be more closely followed. The anthropometric measurements I consider least important for American criminals and conditions, and shall place their results last.

Using all available records and the investigation of criminals, their habitats and associates, what factors stand out most prominently? This shall be considered in a later article.

FRANCES A. KELLOR.

*The University of Chicago.*

## THE COMMERCIAL TRAVELER'S WORK OF CIVILIZATION.

**I**T is only lately that we have arrived at the practical recognition of commerce as the most active pathfinder of civilization. In our day it is almost impossible to consider any great national or international measure without feeling that it has been nourished into shape by commercial roots, despite its fine political leafage. It makes little difference how skillfully our diplomats disguise their business in the raiment of officialdom, whether urging the internal or the external policy of their governments, the same ineffaceable impression is winged upon you, the same belief in the power of commerce, not only as the pioneer but as the mainstay of civilization. We have been in the habit of thinking that the sciences and the arts, as the sovereign powers of the higher culture, were promoting the cause of civilization more than any other factors of improvement in our society; but the delegates to the International Commercial Congress recently held in Philadelphia have opened our eyes so effectually that the error of this inherited belief of ours appears in an almost ludicrous light. If by the arts and the sciences we understand the manifold mental products of the higher culture, we are justified in holding that civilization has no more to do with the arts and the sciences than the plow of the farmer or the anvil of the blacksmith.

A number of years ago the thoroughfares in the towns of Korea were scenes of nightly fights and orgies. As there were no artificial means of lighting the streets, it was not possible to suppress the disorder. An American commercial traveler drops into a town and shows the Korean dealers an assortment of glass tubes containing a most wonderful liquid, which, he assures them, has power when ignited to throw out a moon-like light. All Korea laughs at his claim, but before another year the towns of that island are lighted by kerosene lamps!



The nightly street rows have ceased. In the houses of the inhabitants Japanese metal lamps have been introduced; the liquid from America's rocks nourishes the bright-burning flames: there is light in the houses of Korea. In the old days, when there was "fun in the street" but darkness in the people's houses, the Korean workingman naturally spent his time outdoors for "fun," although he had to take a beating himself occasionally to furnish somebody else with "fun." He has now been put in the way of lighting up his hut, and his mind is beginning to work on more important problems than the mere planning of street fights. And why this change? The secret is that the use of liquid fuel has enabled the Korean people to read and write in their primitive way, and peacefully to entertain themselves, just at the time of day when their work closes and they are at leisure. A modern power plant is constructed, and now copper wires drawn from American ore throw out thousands of volts of electric light over the land of Korea—this roughly-handled ocean jewel of contention between Japan and China—which may now be regarded as one of the most distant outposts of civilization. This is not merely a simile, but the actual method by which the people of Korea were induced to turn from the twilight of their sinister, pagan past toward the sunlight of our time—not only the light of civilization, but the light of kerosene and electric lamps as well.

Almost a century before the advent of the commercial traveler in Korea, the science of theology had been there making the sign of the cross over all the land, to the open-eyed wonder of the aborigines. The science of strategy pounced upon the island almost at the same time—conquest-bent, eager for prey; but Korea was not advanced by the advent of these sciences, nor would any amount or quality of science ever have availed to improve her condition. The coming of the European soldier was even unfortunate in that it gave the natives a wrong impression of what civilization really means; and we cannot blame the Koreans because they refused to accept the white man's belief and customs, preferring to practise their inherited native idolatry and methods of fighting.

That which, more than anything else, put the people of Korea on a civilized basis was the bonds of trade; and the man who first converted them from barbarism to try the principles of trade was a commercial traveler.

A glance at the pages of history only serves to strengthen our belief that the principles of trade have always exerted the most decided and dominating influence in shaping the main course of the world's development. That there have been periods of continued warfare, during which friendly interchange of products has not been maintained, only reminds us that whenever the principle of trade was allowed to flourish it was always productive in improving and developing the economic growth of nations. What caused the Phœnicians to venture beyond the Mediterranean in their rude galleys? Why did Cæsar lead his armies victoriously through the world of his day? What was the Spaniards' motive in conquering savage peoples in South America, converting their lands into tributary colonies? We may question indefinitely and search the remotest corners of history for examples, but the answer must remain the same; for, although nations have always entertained warlike objects, it is manifest that no aggressive campaign in the past was ever conducted without expectations of monetary as well as territorial gain. And it is significant that, in the leading issues where the world's progress shows most prominently, the motive power and basis have always been a great national commerce, with active import and export trade. It was by the powerful support of just such trade that the periods of ancient culture, which may be named by simply mentioning their chief commercial centers—Babylon, Rome, Athens, Alexandria—were called to life and maintained for centuries.

We are so accustomed to meet traveling salesmen—they prance so persistently in and out of our offices with samples and price-lists—that we do not think much about their proper position in society. But these thousands of energetic, practical persons, who are continually rushing to and fro among the nations—are they not the very ones who have made this world

of ours at least ten times smaller than in the Middle Ages, as far as distances are concerned? And do they not represent the persuasive force of our time, which has induced the nations to coöperate and raise the volume of international exchange of products into many hundred millions of dollars, on the foundation of a system of credit, mutual security and trust, such as the medieval rulers would have envied?

We are indebted principally to the commercial traveler for the popular demand for the preservation of international peace, and for the fusing together of the economic interests of nations that has changed the world from a place of warfare into a market for the products of the earth. From our present point of view, the eighteenth century resembles a world of fortifications bristling with cannon and warlike preparations; we think of the nations of the past as standing behind the ramparts, watching one another like hawks, ready to touch off their artillery. To undertake a journey through Europe in those days was a formidable piece of work, an undertaking fraught with not a little danger; and if you were successful in overcoming the various obstacles that the governments laid in your way, you were likely to return sharing the feeling of a military spy who has slipped away from hostile pickets. Nowadays it is a pleasure to travel about the world, a luxury within the reach of the plain citizen; and the nations have been brought as close together as townships in a State. There is no longer any real enmity between the peoples; it only exists between the various governments, which are mostly conducting their affairs in accordance with medieval military principles. Whenever Germans and Frenchmen meet, hat in hand, talking over a salable assortment of samples, they get along amicably and a trade is generally made; but when their governments press them into a soldier's uniform and order them to shoot each other, a pardonable degree of mutual ill-feeling is caused. Here in the United States we are afforded a striking proof of the fact that the various nations of the world—peoples that in Europe and Asia are threatening one another with cries for revenge—can be induced to work side

by side, in peace and union of interests, when placed beyond the range of their warlike rulers.

Who is accountable for the advent of this pleasant change in human sentiment but the mercantile traveler? Has he not furnished the basis, in the shape of a peaceful international business interchange, on which the arts and the sciences have reared the civilization and culture of our time? All the art and science in the world, all the accumulated stores of wisdom and collected experience of the ages, could never have accomplished this work; and without the fructifying medium of trade, mankind would never have made a forward stride. Only the inborn human desire for peaceful and lucrative exchange of products—the strong pinions of international commerce—was capable of carrying primeval man into the broad daylight of the present. It was not our great men of science or learning that were chosen to perform this greatest of the undertakings of our century: it was such totally unknown fellows as James This, Pierre That, and Fritz, Juan, Dimitri, Jonathan, or whatever names we may select to represent the great trading nations. In other words, it was a rôle so complex and so manifold in all its vast importance that Providence seems to have been unwilling to trust any one individual or any one nation with the task of carrying it out; therefore, it was parceled out in the shape of practical problems and enterprises for the thousands of mercantile travelers who have civilized the present century. They have altered the world from a scene of international warfare and a pleasure park for the privileged classes into a really habitable earth for people of all classes to live on, under conditions that are being gradually improved and more equally distributed with each generation. That standing armies and the practical manifestations of militarism have increased with the development of mercantile interests is as nothing compared with the fact that the armies of to-day in reality only exist as safeguards for national trade interests—the mercantile instinct of self preservation and protection. When the great Powers try to extend their domains in Asia and Africa it is more for the pur-

pose of acquiring new markets for their export trade than from a desire for conquest. The political business that we still persist in misnaming "international diplomacy" is getting to partake refreshingly of the nature of the commercial policy of the nations, especially when we compare it with the sort of diplomacy that was the pride of the eighteenth century. We now confer "diplomatically" about tariffs and trade treaties, customs reciprocity, postal laws, treaties of export and import trade, etc.; briefly, we urge "diplomatically" a number of international questions, which almost invariably take final shape as questions of trade, no matter in what disguise they may be brought upon the stage of diplomacy.

At the International Commercial Congress in Philadelphia we were afforded the most conclusive proof that the predominating mercantile tendency of our time is not only a matter of figures and statistics but also a matter of awakened conscience with the nations of the earth.

To be a traveling salesman has never been considered a very great honor; and why? No doubt because the honor of civilizing the nations was parceled out by Providence among the travelers in such a multiplicity of "job lots" that no single man has been able to monopolize the honor. The farmer and the manufacturer do not concern themselves much about these things—the consumers still less, perhaps; these people only occupy their minds with supplying and shaping and marketing the products for which the traveler creates a demand. The traveler himself can hardly be said to understand his true position as a social factor. He does not stop to consider that were it not for his sensible, courteous, confiding manner of doing business the nations would not have drawn as closely together as they now are; nor would the international bonds of friendship exist that now preserve the peace essential to progress.

Whether our friend the traveler introduces fly-paper into Palestine, wind-mills into the Argentine, machinery into China, agricultural products and implements into distant regions in South America, or promotes the establishment of

railroads and manufactures in India and Japan—or whether he capitalizes wool-spinning mills in Persia or tea-plantation syndicates in Paraguay—he remains the same indefatigable pioneer and pathfinder of civilization: the entering wedge of international commerce, providing and maintaining the impregnable economic basis that supports that palace of the arts, the sciences, and the supreme human spirit, known as culture.

JOHANNES HROLF WISBY.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*



## EVOLUTION AND IMMORTALITY.

### (I.)

WHEN the evolutionary theory was first propounded it startled the world. It was welcomed by the atheist and the materialist as an ally. It was looked upon by the Church with suspicion and generally met with positive antagonism. It was feared that the doctrine if established would overthrow the very foundations of the Christian faith. But the hopes of the one and the fears of the other have for the most part been dispelled. Instead of antagonism between evolution and Christianity, there are now indications that evolution will prove an ally to the Church and a handmaid to true religion. The purpose of this paper is to consider the relation of evolution to the question of man's immortality. Does it deny immortality; or is it a dumb oracle with no word either of hope or of despair; or does it point with prophetic finger to a deathless life beyond the grave?

We may get a suggestion of the attitude of evolution toward immortality by considering the function of death in evolution. One of the most remarkable discoveries of recent years is that death did not enter the world with the first beginnings of life. The first living cells were deathless. At the very beginning and at the very bottom of organic life we find immortality. The lowest form of life on earth is the one-celled organism. This never dies a natural death; unless it meet a violent death it will live forever. Weismann says: "Natural death occurs only among many-celled beings; it is not found among one-celled organisms. . . . Death is not an essential attribute of living matter." Bütschli remarks: "When we observe the history of the continual production of certain Protozoa we meet the most singular fact that in the life of these organisms death in the sense of the annihilation of organized matter, and from causes which are inherent in the organism, does not prop-

erly occur." Dr. Newman Smyth says: "The first one-celled organism does not exist for a season, produce another like itself, and then decay and totally disappear; it does nothing of the sort. The one thing that it does is not to die but to live on. It succeeds in living on and on by a very simple yet persistent process: for after awhile it divides itself into two cells, each like itself, and thus it continues to exist, living in these cells a double life." Now, this is a very significant fact; it shows that death is not a primary and necessary but a secondary and incidental event in Nature.

If death is not a physical necessity, then it is a utility. This inference is confirmed by the further researches of the biologist. The field is comparatively new, and no very definite conclusions have yet been reached concerning the special utilities of death. But enough has been found to justify the general conclusion that death in the course of Nature is not to be regarded as a disaster—as a meaningless calamity—but as a means to an end; and that end is the advancement of the species. These researches show that sex and death were introduced in Nature at the same time, thus showing that they are coöperative and perhaps mutually dependent factors in the development of Nature. Again, heredity is recognized as an important factor in evolution, and we cannot conceive how heredity could do its work without the assistance of death. When one generation has pushed its way as far upward as its powers will permit, death takes the old away and leaves the new to take up the work and carry it still higher. Were it not for death the streams of life would become clogged up, the vigorous young life would be fettered and held back by the old, and heredity as a factor in evolution would be practically eliminated. The Darwinian factor of "natural selection" depends for its efficiency entirely on death; the "survival of the fittest" means the removal by death of the weaker individuals. The utility of death is well summed up by Dr. Smyth: "We find that death has many uses in the economy of Nature; that it is indeed so useful that life itself has to call upon death to help it forward on its endless way. We discover that natural

death is only in appearance an enemy; that in reality it is a servant and helpmeet of life. . . . In consequence of death, life develops, and the ministry of death is throughout a service for life. . . . The one regnant, radiant fact of Nature is life—and death enters and follows as a servant for life's sake."

But how shall we apply this truth of the utility of death in Nature to the question of man's immortality? If man is but a link in evolution's chain, then the only conclusion we can draw from this premise is that death will help to *lift* the race—will coöperate with the other factors of evolution in pushing upward this human link until it is merged into some link still higher in the series. But here we find two facts that force a different conclusion. In the first place man is not a mere link in the chain—he is the end of the chain. He is not one in a series of means—he is the end for which all the means have existed. Evolutionary science declares in emphatic language that man is the goal of evolution, and that so far as the physical man is concerned evolution has finished its work. "On the earth there will never be a higher creature than Man," says John Fiske. "It is a daring prophecy," says Henry Drummond, commenting on the above, "but every probability of science attests the likelihood of its fulfilment. The goal looked forward to from the beginning of time has been attained. Nature has succeeded in making a man. She can go no further: organic evolution has done its work." The accepted verdict of science is that there is no probability that a physical organization superior to man's body can be developed on earth. The second fact that confronts us here is that with the advent of man evolution changed almost immediately its field of operation. Hitherto it had bent its energies to the perfecting of the body; henceforth it leaves the now finished body and devotes its energies to *mind*. Hitherto it was mainly physical; henceforth it is almost entirely psychical. With the making of the human body, organic evolution practically finished its work and retired into the background—and psychic evolution entered into its kingdom. In view of these two facts,

the conclusions we must draw as to the utility of death to man are evident: first, if man is the goal of evolution, then death, along with all evolutionary factors, must work to the perfecting of men for their own sake; and second, if the physical man be finished and evolution in man operates only in the psychic realm, then the utility of death as applied to man must be found in the development of the soul.

These considerations suggest and make probable the hypothesis that physical death is but a necessary process in the evolution of the soul. Death is but a crisis in the life of the soul by which it passes from one stage of development to another. Man, in his embryonic history, passes through several successive stages, each of which has a function to perform in his development. At first he exists in germ, in a spherule of protoplasm. He outgrows this, breaks the fetters, and enters into a higher life. But still he is inclosed in prison walls, bound by physical ties to the mother, receiving his blood through her veins. When this stage has done its work in the development of the man, he leaves his uterine home and is born into a higher life, where with individualized body, and with new environments and new conditions, he continues his evolution. Through the sensorium he acquires knowledge; the body becomes the instrument of his activity. Through the body and by the body the soul is molded and developed. But there comes a time when he outgrows this stage, as he did the preceding stages. The body has performed its function—it has helped forward the soul as far as Nature intended it should. Henceforth it would be no longer a help but a hindrance, and must be laid aside. So the body dies and the soul, the man himself, is born into a higher realm to continue his evolution under conditions of which we cannot conceive.

We find some beautiful and instructive analogies to this in Nature. In the vegetable kingdom we may take Paul's analogy of the wheat. The life-principle of the wheat is wrapped up in a material body, and there it remains until it can adapt itself to a higher and freer and more active life; then it lets go the infolding matter, which decays and becomes

to the new plant no more than any other matter. There is an invisible, undiscoverable life-principle that survives the destruction of the grain and builds for itself a new body. The material grain is simply a stage in the life of the wheat, and the decay of the grain is the crisis wherein the life passes from a lower into a higher stage. The development of the wheat-life depends not on the continuance of the grain but on its destruction. Thus, in the wheat, death is a necessary process in the evolution of life. There is a still more beautiful analogy in the animal kingdom. Take the transformation of the worm into the butterfly, "Nature's gospel of the resurrection." At first a mere worm, creeping upon the earth, stupid and unattractive; and then from the dead body of the worm rises a winged creature of wondrous beauty, floating upon the air, feeding upon the flowers, bathing its glorious wings in the sunlight, moving with the rapidity of thought, as free as the zephyrs in which it sports. And yet the lowly worm and the glorious butterfly are the same individual, only in different stages of evolution. There is an identity between the two, not an identity of material body but of individualized life. Open the chrysalis at a certain stage and you will find the embryo of the butterfly—the butterfly-body inside the worm-body, fed through its agency but not identical with it. The worm-body is a necessary stage in the development of the butterfly. When this is no longer a help but becomes a hindrance, it dies, and the butterfly rises into a higher life and attains its perfect form. It is indeed a "resurrection from the dead"—the butterfly is raised up from the dead body of the worm. And thus it is a type of the death of the human body and the resurrection of the soul—the physical body performs its function in the evolution of the soul and dies, and the immortal spirit breaks the fetters of clay and mounts into the skies. As the shedding of the chrysalis is a necessary process in the evolution of the butterfly, so the death of the human body is a necessary process in the evolution of the soul.

Such is the significance of death to the Christian evolutionist. It is the wheat leaving behind its grain and rising into a more

abundant life. It is the butterfly bursting forth from the chrysalis and soaring aloft. It is a new birth—the soul born from the womb of earth into the light of heaven. It is the bud opening its calyx and bursting into glorious blossom. Death is not a curse pronounced on the race because “Adam sinned,” but a blessing decreed by the all-wise and loving Father. It is not a “penalty” man must pay for his sins, but a necessary means for the development of the soul. Death is not death at all—it is the beginning of life. As Browning puts it—

You never know what life means till you die.  
Even throughout life, 'tis death that makes life live—  
Gives it whatever the significance.

It is the open portal through which the soul may rise into the realms of immortal life and love.

WALTER SPENCE.

*Kingfisher, Okla.*



## A CONTRAST AND A PARALLEL.

### I. IMPERIAL REPUBLICANISM HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

#### *From a Canadian Viewpoint.*

THE visitor to the Capitol at Washington will, if he be a student of Roman history, hardly fail to be struck with the thought that the founders of the Republic must have drawn their inspiration from that source in fixing many of the institutions of the new form of government they were called upon to design. The name of the building itself will carry him back in thought to the famous temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill, in which, on solemn occasions, as the making of treaties, the Roman Fathers were wont to assemble instead of in their ordinary meeting-place, the Curia, that they might make the proceedings more impressive by the sacred nature of the place. The architecture, too, is of the Græco-Roman style, closely resembling that traditionally ascribed to the ancient capitol at Rome, and containing many of the distinctive features—such as the dome and the Greek colonnades and entablatures—that belong to Roman public buildings of a later date. In the name of their higher legislative body, again, he will find traces of the same tendency to copy Roman models; and passing to consider the functions of this body he will find important points in which these latter correspond closely with the functions of the Roman senate in the time of the republic, while differing from those of the House of Lords in Britain, for which at first sight it might seem to be a substitute. One of these points is the power of making treaties, which is vested in the case of the United States in the President and Senate, as in the old Roman republic it lay with the consuls and senate. In Great Britain, on the other hand, this power virtually lies with the representatives of the people in the House of Commons, subject to the approval of the sovereign.

Such resemblances between the institutions of the United

States and those of republican Rome might be expected to happen when we consider the circumstances in which those of the former country arose. Having turned their backs, so to speak, on monarchical government and its institutions when they resolved to separate from the mother-land, and having before them in the nations of the earth at that time no existing model of republican government worthy of serving as an archetype for the government of a country of so vast extent and so great prospects, the founders of the Republic were driven to seek in history precedents in regard to terms and forms to be used in their infant polity; and especially in the history of that greatest of ancient republics and lawmakers—Rome before the time of the Cæsars.

While it seems plain that they availed themselves to a considerable extent of the forms and methods in vogue among the Romans in establishing their body politic, yet we can scarcely doubt that they would be warned by the mistakes of the same people, and that they would take measures to prevent the recurrence of these in their own history; for the men at the head of affairs during the inception of the present form of government in the United States were, many of them, men of learning and culture. Madison and Hamilton, the two most prominent among the framers of the Constitution, were college graduates; while associated with them were such men as Franklin, the eminent philosopher; Jefferson, distinguished alike for his learning, polished manners, and eminently practical nature; and Washington himself, declared by Patrick Henry to be "for solid information and sound judgment unquestionably the greatest man in the assembly" (that of Virginia). That such men could be blind to the teachings of Roman history in regard to the dangers to a republican government resulting from the extension of its power over unassimilable peoples, and the consequent maintenance of large standing armies for purposes of defense against internal and external foes, is quite improbable. And we find, indeed, ample evidence in the history of the times to show that they were fully alive to these dangers. The famous "Monroe Doctrine,"

contained in that President's message to Congress in March, 1822, did but assert what had been and still is the settled policy of the more conservative element in the United States, when it stated that it should be the policy of its people "neither to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe nor to suffer the Powers of the Old World to interfere with the affairs of the New." In other words, this class has strenuously opposed at all times measures that in their ultimate consequences would bring about the same state of affairs, socially and politically, on this continent that exists in Europe. Chief among these measures they have always considered to be all attempts at territorial aggrandizement on the part of the Republic outside of the continent of North America. The very first principle of the Constitution, as stated in the opening paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created free and equal," would indeed seem to be violated by the extension of the power of the Republic over peoples who would necessarily, from their inferior status in point of civilization, be held to be unfit for citizenship in the commonwealth of the United States. A second and probably more important consideration in the minds of the class of citizens I have mentioned is that of the change in the military and naval equipment of the country that such a policy would necessitate. With the acquisition of foreign possessions would most certainly arise the need for large standing armies and costly fleets. Added to this would be the greater danger of entanglement in war with other powerful nations whose interests would of necessity from time to time clash with those of the Republic in these outlying portions of her "empire" (for such it would properly be called). And, lastly, there can scarcely fail to loom up in the background before the mind of the thoughtful and intelligent citizen the danger I have already alluded to—the possibility of undue influence of the military element on the functions of the government.

The Roman Republic, which owed its establishment, according to history, to the subversion of the earlier monarchical form of government in a revolution caused by the tyrannous

conduct of King Tarquin, began in the year 509 B.C. and continued its existence as such until the time of Augustus, the first Emperor of Rome, B.C. 30. Originally including only the city of Rome and the districts in the immediate neighborhood, it gradually, through the aggressive nature of its people, extended its power over the adjoining Italian States, until about the year 264 B.C. the Romans found themselves virtually masters of all Italy. In that year began the first Punic war between Rome and the great commercial and colonizing city of Carthage, for the possession of the island of Sicily—a struggle that ultimately led to the complete conquest of the latter power by Rome and the transference to her of all the Carthaginian colonies, including Spain, Sicily, and the north of Africa. How, step by step, Rome extended her conquests in the lands surrounding the Mediterranean until all these had been brought under her sway; how the drafted armies of citizens of earlier times, called together on each occasion when the interests of the republic demanded it for defensive or offensive operations against some neighboring tribe, in time gave way to standing armies composed of mercenaries, many of them of foreign birth, who owed allegiance rather to the general who provided them with plunder and lands for military colonies than to the State; how the commanders of these armies soon usurped the supreme power in the State, making the senate obey their will in all things—which in turn led to the series of civil wars between the two parties in Rome, beginning with that in which the two rival generals, Marius and Sulla, disputed the supremacy of the Roman world, and culminating in the similar struggle between Antony and Octavianus, which, on the defeat of the former at the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., left the latter sole ruler of the republic whose institutions were henceforth to exist only in name, the "Imperator," or commander of the army, being thereafter the real ruler of Rome;—these facts in Roman history are too well known to call for repetition here, were it not for the purpose of pointing out the similarity between the course of events in the American Republic up to the present time and that in the Roman Repub-

lic in its earlier periods, and to suggest the possibility of a similar fate for republican institutions in the United States if she persists in following Rome's example in the matter of territorial aggrandizement.

For over a century the Republic has adhered strictly to the policy laid down in the Monroe Doctrine in avoiding so far as possible entanglements with European Powers over matters relating to the Eastern hemisphere, and has been content to pursue her mission of civilization and industrial development in the vast territories that have fallen to her lot on the North American continent. She has added to her original territories, it is true—by purchase, as in the case of Louisiana, or by conquest, as in the cases of Texas and California—large tracts of land on this continent; but these were such as, from their geographical position and comparatively uninhabited condition, might fittingly be added—to make her commercial facilities satisfactory and to afford room for the overflow of her population from the congested districts of the Eastern States. But, while little or no opposition has been made by any section of her people to these additions to her territory, it has been quite a different matter when measures looking to the extension of her power over places outside of this continent have been proposed. Then there has always been manifested the strongest opposition on the part of a large and influential part of the people of the Republic; and hitherto the counsels of these latter have prevailed, so that up to the year of grace 1898 the United States has refrained from securing even a coaling station outside of her possessions on this continent. With the annexation of Hawaii and the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico, as well as the establishment of the protectorate over Cuba, as a result of the war with Spain, there is now inaugurated a distinct departure from this non-expansionist policy of her former rulers. In spite of the remonstrances heard against this course from the press, from leading citizens all over the country, and in the halls of Congress, the present government seems bent on pursuing it unflinchingly. Already measures are being taken to increase

the army to one hundred thousand men and to make additions to the navy that will raise it to the third place among the navies of the world. Thus the year just passed may well be deemed the beginning of a new era in the history of the United States. The die has apparently been cast, and henceforward she will play her part among the colonizing and empire-seeking nations of the earth.

The trite saying that "history repeats itself" would thus seem verified in comparing the course of events in the United States up to the present with that which took place in republican Rome in the evolution of the military autocracy that finally took the place of her popular institutions of government. As Rome, through the aggressive and lofty spirit of her people, first subdued and extended her system of government to the whole Italian peninsula, her natural limits, with safety and even benefit to her republican institutions, and inasmuch as the peoples so conquered were gradually assimilated and became part of her citizenship, so the American Republic, in the additions she has thus far made to her original territories by annexing outlying portions of this continent, has increased her resources and power without imperiling her democratic institutions. And when we see those causes which, in a large measure at least, brought about the downfall of republican government in the Italian State now existent in the United States—I refer to the desire for territorial aggrandizement in other parts of the globe—who will say that it is altogether visionary to suppose that these causes may act similarly on this form of government at the present day?

It is no doubt true that times and circumstances have altered much since Rome's failure to combine imperialism with republicanism made it possible to point to her history for a moral in respect to this. The greater respect for law and order implanted in the minds of the individuals of a State in modern times might at first sight be thought sufficient to nullify all arguments drawn from a comparison between the political conditions in the modern and the ancient republics. But the history of modern times is not reassuring on this point. England



in the time of the Commonwealth, though nominally a republic, was in reality governed by Cromwell and his army—a military despotism of the strictest kind; yet Cromwell and his army were noted for their piety and their God-fearing lives. Again, the history of France during the last hundred years furnishes numerous examples of the pernicious influence of militarism on the functions of a republican government. It is unnecessary in this connection to do more than mention the downfall of the republican governments at the hands of Napoleon I. and Napoleon III., and the overweening conduct of the French army-leaders toward the French government at the present time, to show the constant menace that the army offers to republican government in France. Moreover, if examples be sought more applicable to the case in point, the well-known indifference of the military authorities to the wishes, or even commands, of Congress during certain periods of the civil war may be mentioned to show that the same state of things that has just been described as occurring in other countries under a democratic government is by no means impossible in the United States.

That the United States, having organized settled forms of government in the vast extent of territory within the Union, should have a consciousness of possessing administrative ability in this respect and should desire to take her place among the great nations in extending her influence over, and seeking commercial relations with, other portions of the globe, is only what might naturally be expected. Many influences conspire to cause the development of such a sentiment in the Republic at the present stage of its existence. The consciousness of inherent power, dependent on the high intelligence and ability to utilize the most subtle development of art and science of a large part of her people, and on the vastness and varied nature of her resources; the desire on the part of her citizens for new openings for industrial and commercial enterprises; the deep and serious interest awakened in the minds of many of her people in the welfare of benighted and down-trodden races, by the missionary efforts put forth by her for the Chris-

tianizing and uplifting of these, and the consequent desire to further these aims by the influence and assistance of her government;—these are factors contributing to the development of this sentiment, and they must certainly be admitted to appeal strongly to the instincts that have made the English-speaking peoples of the world the progressive and civilizing race they are to-day.

In the face of such a sentiment, grounded as it is on considerations so reasonable and so laudable in themselves, arguments for pursuing a more cautious line of policy are apt to be thought inopportune and savoring of lack of ambition. Such arguments must be founded mainly on the limitations that attend a republican form of government. Granted that the original Constitution of the United States may be so modified as to admit of the existence of political inequalities among those whom she governs; and admitting her ability to maintain large fleets and armies for the protection of her interests in foreign parts without burdening her Treasury excessively—it must still be open to question whether her form of government is adapted to the conditions that will result from the innovation now being made in her foreign policy. |||

The example of Great Britain may be adduced in support of the ability of English-speaking and English-thinking peoples to govern inferior races with advantage alike to themselves and to the governed. But, though Americans possess kinship with the people of Great Britain, and have a common origin, language, and literature, as well as common moral and religious sentiments, yet the difference in the social and political systems of the two countries has produced marked differences in the character of the two peoples, both individually and as nations. In Great Britain there are produced among all classes up to the sovereign, by the action of their graded social system, a thorough respect for authority and habits of ready obedience to superiors. Moreover, there is a fixedness and stability about the monarchical and aristocratic form of government that prevent the unsettling of men's minds in regard to their allegiance. Since, however, parties may differ on minor points,

they are bound by their duties as subjects to be loyal to their sovereign. On the other hand, the spirit of equality inculcated by the institutions of the American Republic certainly is not favorable to the development of the characteristics just mentioned. In a country in which "every boy is born with the idea that he may one day be President," this latter functionary is not likely to inspire the same amount of personal loyalty among his less fortunate compeers that is usually bestowed on a sovereign. Hence the outspoken vituperation and denunciation of persons in authority and their principles that are witnessed in the United States when party feeling runs high. For why should it not be so, since the most powerful official of to-day may be merely the private citizen of to-morrow in case his party is defeated at the polls? This free-born and independent spirit among the citizens of the Republic may or may not of itself be a more desirable spirit than that which prevails in Great Britain; but there can be little doubt that it renders the problem of government more difficult in those cases in which there is a contest for supremacy between parties having widely different interests.

Already the causes that foster excessive party spirit among her people are sufficiently numerous and potent in the United States to produce alarm in the minds of many of her statesmen. The varied and antagonistic interests of different sections of the Union; the conflicts between labor and capital, such as those that led to the riots at Pittsburgh and Chicago within the last few years—these are circumstances tending to show that the Republic is liable at any time to experience convulsions arising from internal troubles which it may tax her vital powers to overcome. If to these sources of irritation and domestic strife there be added the constant anxieties and burdens inseparable from the position of an empire-seeking Power such as the United States now bids fair to be, then, as all history shows, the partizan and sectional spirit will inevitably be increased. And, with the examples adduced before us showing the proneness of militarism to assert itself and make its power felt in a republic

at such critical times, it can hardly be said that the United States is likely under the new order of things to be altogether free from this danger.

In regard to the ability of the United States to follow the example of Great Britain in ruling inferior races successfully from the standpoint of the latter, historical evidence is not reassuring. She has had considerable experience in that line with the original inhabitants of the country now occupied by her people; and, while the Indian tribes under the British flag in Canada have made fair progress in the path of civilization, the remnants of those within her borders have mostly remained savage and implacable enemies of their white neighbors. Nor, again, can she fairly plead her necessities in support of the policy of expansion. While Great Britain, with her overflowing population must perforce seek outlets for these in far-off colonies and markets for her manufactures in less highly civilized portions of the globe, the same is not true of the United States. Possessing territories affording the choice of almost every kind of climate and ample room for the increase of population for generations to come, there could be little inducement for her citizens to betake themselves to distant parts for settlement, as we find the citizens of Great Britain doing in the case of her colonies and dependencies. And, while foreign dependencies might be of benefit to the United States in furnishing a market for her manufactures and in supplying the raw material for these, it is doubtful if the advantages to be obtained would compensate her for the expense which the great increase in her army and navy, necessitated by the possession of these dependencies, would entail.

That the present crisis would, sooner or later, make its appearance in the history of the United States would seem to be but the natural sequence of her growth and development. History bears constant witness to the truth that nations, like individuals, are wont to experience the desire for greater power and enlarged spheres of influence just in proportion as the ability to obtain them becomes plain to their consciousness. The ultimate effects on themselves of such expansion would

seem to be but seldom seriously considered; or if the voice of reason be at all heard in any case in opposition to this instinct for aggrandizement, it is usually but little heeded. And thus again is presented the spectacle of a republican nation being hurried headlong on a career of empire-seeking in obedience to the instinct we have mentioned, despite the warnings of history, the protests of many of her most thoughtful citizens, and the prescient voice of the Father of his Country—sounding down through the century that has elapsed since his Farewell Address was written, solemnly charging his successors in office to beware of the temptations of such a time as the present, which he foresaw would inevitably come to endanger the existence of the constitutional principles he had so carefully guarded.

H. BONIS, B.A.

*Leamington, Ont., Can.*



## II. THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND THE UNITED STATES.

THE task of examining, in the light of Roman history and experience, the social and political conditions now existing in America would exhaust the energies of a Gibbon, while charming the imagination of a Froude. But such is not my purpose. It is simply to show a few points at which the Roman civilization, whether by contrast or by likeness, seems to touch our own. These contrasts and resemblances are found in the period of Roman history included between the accession of Augustus and the death of Marcus Aurelius. While during these two centuries to outward view the Empire was most flourishing, yet it was then the evils that destroyed it first became evident.

In the expanse of territory there is a striking parallel between the United States of America and the possessions of Rome. We may well be impressed with the extent of our dominion, especially since in these latter days we have included within it Cuba, the Philippines, and Alaska. Yet the Roman Empire,

stretching from the Euphrates on the east to Gibraltar on the west, and from Sahara on the south to the Baltic on the north, was as comprehensive as our own. But, though so vast, this Empire was still a unit. The commerce of the world was carried in Roman ships to and from Roman ports. The grain raised in the Valley of the Nile was borne over Roman roads to Roman soldiers guarding the frontiers of Roman power in the Highlands of Scotland. The sword so finely tempered by the Toledo smith at his Spanish forge was worn by the Roman Pro-Consul when, clad in Tyrian purple, he received the submission to Roman authority of the fierce tribes beyond the Tigris. The different races within the confines of the Empire lived peacefully and securely beneath the sway of Roman equity. There was the same law, adjusted to local conditions, for the turbulent Jew in Jerusalem and for the gentle Greek at Marseilles. The same legion might in a generation see service in the German forest and the Arabian desert; and, whether natives of Britain or of Dalmatia, the soldiers followed the same standards and worshiped the same gods.

But with this unity there existed, as with us, the utmost diversity. Many peoples have been ingrafted upon our nation, and we have conferred upon them the priceless boon of our citizenship; but as many nations lived beneath Roman institutions and received permission from the Eternal City to call themselves Romans!

While thus in some respects the parallel is close, there are others in which the contrast is strong. The Roman order was imposed from without—on civilizations already existing—while those who have sought our protection by coming to our shores have done so of their own volition. Therefore, though they have somewhat influenced American civilization, to a far greater extent they have entered it as a component part. The Roman world-empire may be described as objective, while the American empire owes its triumph to subjective methods.

Perhaps the contrasts and parallels between the old Roman civilization and our own, seen simply from the external and material viewpoint, serve to interest us rather as coincidences



in conditions between two great empires than as indications that the history of the one will repeat itself in the destiny of the other. But if their external resemblances be mere accidents we still have the more reason to wonder at the appearance in America to-day of social and other conditions once found in Rome. These conditions indicate the presence of forces of evil; but marshaled against them are forces of life unknown to old Rome, and, as we believe, unmatched in vitality and potency. The Roman Empire has perished from off the earth, leaving many monuments of its glory but no successor to its power. The problem of America's destiny, because it may be studied in the light of the world's great past and yet is concealed in the mists of new conditions and enwrapped in the folds of untried experiments, becomes the most fascinating, nay, bewitching problem the human mind has ever sought to solve.

The symptoms of decay in the Roman State were many, but none stood forth more prominently than did the growth in luxurious necessities, which sapped the energies while it whetted the appetites of her citizens. Yet it is not strange that increase in a nation's wealth should bring to the authors of it a more luxurious mode of living. The vital question to us as Americans is whether this increasing luxury means of necessity a resulting decadence in national life. Certainly the difference between the wealth of the generation that established this Republic and the wealth of our own is infinitely greater, both comparatively and actually, than was the difference in wealth between the Rome of Scipio and the Rome of Augustus. But we learn from this comparison that the strength of a nation lies in the character of her citizens, not in the value of their possessions.

It is not from the viewpoint of wealth alone that some of the shadows of Roman conditions seem to brood over our land. Blended with the financial are social influences—evil in their tendencies—common to both empires. As the richer classes withdraw from the service of the State, they devote their consequent leisure to the pursuit of trifles. As ever was the case, so now, the result is to substitute degrading vice for insipid folly, and later crime itself for vice.

The basing of social position upon monetary considerations was a practise much in vogue among the contemporaries of Nero. So Roman conditions here repeat themselves in the mad rush for wealth that has left many a man to bring up the rear in disappointment and failure. The resulting pessimism is sad to see. It means that many a family will die out in this generation, while the dread of a similar misfortune combines with other causes to make the children of our well-to-do classes less numerous than the social economist deems wise. A comparatively few persons are thus amassing the greater part of the nation's wealth.

But the picture is not wholly dark. No slave population stands amongst us as a menace to our social order. Our people are free—every child born in our land accepts the obligations by receiving the privileges of citizenship. In Rome only a limited number of her denizens were citizens, and even to the favored few citizenship meant the possession of special prerogatives as against the State, and not, as with us, the right to name our rulers and then to direct their counsels. This nation is a Democracy. The greatest and the meanest of her children have an equal opportunity to control her destinies. This equality of rights among all our citizens is perhaps the point of distinction most radical between the Roman State and our own. What one man is, any man may become. This is the belief of our people, for thus they read our history. They know, too, that the remedy for every evil lies, at the last resort, within their grasp. They are so conscious of their power they seldom deign to use it.

We have, as had the Romans, a great reverence for Law. We resent any suspicion upon the integrity of our courts. We have idealized them, and regard them as the repositories of the highest earthly wisdom and the dispensers of the purest earthly justice. It thus practically becomes possible for the judges who preside over them to act as the agents of the people, and to check, sometimes even to destroy in a lawful manner, the evils incident to existing social and governmental conditions. But if ever our courts should lose the respect and confidence of

our people, and come to be regarded as the instruments of class oppression or as the ministers of individual ambition, then Roman history will repeat itself in the necessity and consequent creation of a military dictator.

The comparison between the intellectual side of Roman civilization and the same side of our own affords a study of great interest. With us there exists a liberality, a tolerance for all dissenting types of thought, such as is not found in history since Constantine accepted the Christian religion. The earlier Romans had this tolerance, though their successors lost it. The former had, as we have, a belief in abstract Truth; but we are as careless as were they concerning its expression. This carelessness may be akin to indifference: doubtless with most of us it is so. The discoveries of Science have made us skeptical of all dogmatism. It seems as foolish to us as did the dogmatics of the ancient world to its philosophers. The tolerant skepticism of the Romans may be traced to causes very different from those that have produced in this generation the same result.

But it is external phenomena that we are now comparing; and nowhere may they be compared with more interest than in a study of the attitude assumed by the people of the ancient and modern world respectively toward paganism in the one and Christianity in the other. Thus, while many like Cicero believed in the gods of the fathers, there were others who, having rejected as fables the folk-lore of the old faith, were unable to grasp the spiritual meaning of these same stories; while on the other side were the great mass of the people still clinging devotedly to the theology of the past and ignoring the inadequacy of that theology to the necessities of the present. We see, in this age, resulting in part from the study and criticism of the things formerly regarded as sacred, a skepticism that asks whether the God of the dominant religion has been truly revealed, and again whether He is absolutely regnant in human affairs. Sometimes, too, the effort is made to substitute a scientific formula for God—to diffuse his proper offices and functions among an army of natural causes; while opposed to these so-called Advanced Thinkers (modern Stoics and Epicureans) are

the great multitude of our people who believe as did their fathers but without their zeal!

There is, however, a complete contrast between Christianity as an ethical force and the paganism of ancient Rome. In its later developments the latter was wholly lacking in that moral power which is the secret of Christianity's strength. This moral earnestness has so fostered the virtues essential to society that we can no longer separate in our thought the one from the other. Thus, with us, Religion is a conserving force, and the State has more or less consistently applied its principles of righteousness to the solution of her problems; while the individual has applied them, certainly in theory, to all the relations of our complicated modern life. Our social system is studied from the viewpoint of ethics, and its success is measured by the degree in which ethical principles are applied to practical questions.

Necessary limitations have prevented our touching on any but a few of the more salient points of comparison between the Roman civilization and our own. But even this brief study has shown that many analogies may with profit be drawn between the greatest Empire of the past and the yet greater Republic of the future.

EDWARD MCK. WHITING.

*New York City.*